

SIGNPOSTS IN DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT:
A COMPUTER-BASED ANALYSIS OF 277 PROJECTS IN AFRICA

AID EVALUATION OCCASIONAL PAPER NO. 10
(Document Order No. PN-AAV-287)

by
Irving Rosenthal, Sector Coordinator for
Development Management
(Center for Development Information and Evaluation, AID)

Janet Tuthill, Consultant
(Management Systems International)

Robert Bury, Independent Consultant

Michael Frazier, Independent Consultant

U.S. Agency for International Development
May 1986

The views and interpretations expressed in this report are those
of the author and should not be attributed to the Agency for
International Development.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgments

Summary

1. Introduction

2. Major Findings and Conclusions

3. Methodology of the Study

4. Characteristics of the Study Sample

4.1 Level of Project Organizational Direction

4.2 Development Management Enhancement Interventions

4.3 Enhancement/Training Component

4.4 Project Assessment

4.5 Development Management Problems

Tables

Appendixes

A. List of Projects in Case Survey

B. Case Survey Questionnaire

C. Coding Instructions for Questionnaire

D. Computer Analysis Method

E. Development Management Case Survey
Computer Files

Bibliography

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study reflects the work of many people. Irving Rosenthal, Bureau for Program and Policy Coordination, Center for Development Information and Evaluation (PPC/CDIE), sector coordinator for the development management study series, designed the present study, set the objectives, and coordinated its completion. Gerald Britan (PPC/CDIE) advised in preparing the research instrument and coding instructions.

The original data base was developed by Michael Frazier, who was assisted in coding the cases by Bruce Shaw. The computer analysis was completed by Robert Bury. Preliminary computer analysis was done by Margee Ensign. Richard Collins, Robert Baker, and Helen Tartaro, members of CDIE, and James Feaster and Susan Mickelwait of IRM/TSD/TRC also assisted. Ruth Mara of CDIE's Development Information Division provided basic documentation and coding information. Janet Tuthill prepared the final report and analysis of the computer findings.

SUMMARY

A computer-based study of 277 agriculture projects in Africa drawn from project documentation in the Development Information System at the Agency for International Development (AID) has yielded some indications, or signposts, of development management issues that bear closer examination through field study or additional quantitative analysis. Through the use of categories {1} of inquiry such as "level at which the project was principally directed," "development management enhancement interventions," "project assessment," and "development management problems," the study has yielded the following major findings:

- o Projects in Africa are still being directed mainly from the national rather than rural level.
- o The kind of local administrative support that a project receives directly affects its success.
- o Technical assistance should be viewed as a means to build host country management capacity as well as to meet project substantive objectives.
- o "Formal schooling" remains the primary "form" of training. Broadening the training to include management as well as technical skills could benefit

projects.

- o The study was not able to determine precisely what constituted project success. Data in AID's information system were often inconclusive on this point.
- o "Contextual factors," in particular "socioeconomic" issues, were considered most important in explaining project success.

=====

(1) Much of the terminology in this report, while appearing to be straight narrative, has special meaning. Appendix C contains the coding instructions for the survey questionnaire, with the specific technical categories on which the coding and analysis are built. The reader may wish to review Appendix C at this time to appreciate the context and interrelationships of the categories. Where necessary to ensure understanding and readability, terms that represent specific questionnaire categories appear within quotation marks in the text.

1. INTRODUCTION

This analysis is a product of the 1984-1985 development management impact study series conducted by the Bureau for Program and Policy Coordination/Center for Development Information and Evaluation (PPC/CDIE). Through a series of field studies {1} performed on six successful agricultural projects in Africa, the analysis identified key project management problems and "enhancement interventions" used to overcome them. Although originally planned to precede and help guide the field studies, this computer analysis was completed simultaneously with the field studies. It provides an opportunity to compare the information obtainable from project documentation in AID/Washington with the insights available from field observation.

The overall study series included a preliminary workshop on the content of the scope of work, six field studies, a post-field-survey seminar to synthesize results, and analytical papers that present major crosscutting issues and lessons learned. The complete series of papers merits review in order to place the results of this computer analysis within the context of the total effort.

=====

(1) Reports describing the results of these six studies are available from the Center for Development Information and Evaluation, Bureau for Program and Policy Coordination, Agency for International Development. See Bibliography for complete references.

2. MAJOR FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Data for this computer analysis were drawn from two sources of information on projects contained in the AID Development Information System (DIS). The primary source, which comprised results of the frequencies and cross-tabulations on the 277 projects and internal and external AID evaluations and audits, yielded the principal findings. A secondary source of data, the written comments in 63 of the 277 cases, produced some findings that go beyond the survey questionnaire. The primary data did not yield findings unknown to experienced practitioners in Africa. However, they did yield results that deserve closer examination.

1. The data did not prove an assumption in the original scope of work for this study that "principal project direction" in Africa has shifted from management at the national level to management at the local level. The data seem to indicate that project planners showed a lack of creativity in choosing different implementing agencies for a wide range of programs. Not as many programs as expected were designed for local- or regional-level management, even though most projects in the sample were targeted at rural populations. Over the 10 years covered by this study just over 50 percent were managed at the local, village, cooperative, or association level. More attention should have been given to management strategies and enhancement interventions applicable to problems, institutions, and people at the local level.

2. Local "project support activities" were the most important "administrative process" constraints to project success. Enhancement of these activities, therefore, should receive more attention. This would confirm an assumption in the original scope of work that projects cannot be looked on as independent, isolated efforts. Their success depends to a great extent on the outside environment or "context." That is, one must look beyond the narrow scope of the project and include external linkages that affect project success. For instance, distance of the project site from decision-makers and support services makes project implementation and coordination more difficult.

3. "Technical assistance," not "training" as some might believe, was the main type of "management enhancement intervention." This finding implies a need for establishing a closer relationship between these two types of "enhancement interventions" so that they are mutually supportive. "Technical assistance" must be seen as a management capacity-building intervention as well as a method for implementing a substantive program purpose.

4. "Formal schooling" was the main "form" of "intervention" in 46 percent of the cases in which "training" was the principal type of "management enhancement" intervention. Most management enhancement training was done in-country (53

percent); only 29 percent of this training was done in the United States.

5. The emphasis on "training" in Africa seems to be on "formal schooling" in the larger cities rather than on less conventional types of training in the rural areas. However, if AID programs in Africa are targeted principally at rural and agricultural development, then training activities should be modified to mesh with the development activities they are supposed to support. In the area of "skills training," a positive relationship seemed to exist between "project success" and "enhancement training" in financial and commodities management. This relationship deserves further examination. To understand the impact that financial and commodities management can have in determining project performance, these data should be disaggregated by other "factors" in the questionnaire such as "project targets" and the "level of organizational direction." It should not always be assumed, for example, that more attention to financial or some other management factor is always better than less attention.

6. Among the "contextual factors" suggested in the research questionnaire as potentially affecting the ability to successfully manage a project, "sociocultural" conditions ranked the highest. "Economic" factors, which one intuitively might have considered more important, in fact had less impact than sociocultural factors and ranked only as important as such factors as "donor procedures" or "geography." "Contextual factors," as a group, had the largest number of responses for factors affecting the successful management of projects. That is, although "internal administrative procedures," as a major group, are important, they cannot be considered apart from the project's context.

7. "Human resources" factors such as "motivation" and "incentives" play a subtle role in project success. This role can be elucidated only through in-depth sociocultural studies, including extensive interviews of project personnel and beneficiaries in the field.

8. Although the effectiveness of management factors is judged against the criterion of a "successful" project, it is difficult to define what constitutes a successful project. While the project was a success if the data sources implied success, there are few objective criteria. This lack of certainty was reflected in the survey responses. Of the sample of 277 cases, 29 percent of the projects were considered "successful"; 20 percent were deemed "somewhat successful"; and 12 percent were listed as "not very successful." A more serious methodological problem, however, is that for 40 percent of the projects there was "insufficient data" from which to make a determination. This may be a commentary on the projects as much as on the evaluation system.

The secondary data source from 63 projects yielded the following additional findings:

1. Poor planning was mentioned in 15 of the 63 cases, along with the observation that project design was overambitious, aiming for unrealistic targets in too short a time frame.

2. Invalid assumptions and faulty knowledge of sociocultural and environmental conditions were mentioned in 13 cases. This included project objectives in conflict with local values, or unspecified agricultural and environmental conditions.

3. The need to actively involve the host country in project design and implementation was mentioned in 11 cases, with particular reference to sustaining project benefits beyond the project's life.

4. Ineffective procurement systems for spare parts and equipment were mentioned for nine projects, with resultant delays that seriously affected implementation.

Project designers and managers should compare and relate the results of this computer survey with the results of the six field studies. It does appear from the computer analysis and the high number of responses for certain factors that the topics raised for further examination are important. Careful scrutiny of the field studies may yield new combinations of factors or additional categories meriting further analysis, although it seems unlikely that whole categories of factors were overlooked in the original design of this study. {2}

=====

(2)Before case surveys are done for other regions, it may be useful to redesign the questionnaire based on suggestions from this analysis. This should be done without changing the basic categories or logic of the survey.

3. METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

This computer-based study of development projects in Africa used a case-survey method to extract information from the project documents available within the DIS. Initially, the sample was to include AID Africa projects that terminated during the 9-year period FY 1975-1983, with some projects that began in FY 1984 included for comparison. However, to focus the study more sharply on longer term, bilateral development efforts, projects dealing with special self-help programs, human rights activities, project design and study, disaster assistance, and regional and commodity import projects were eliminated from the sample. After removing duplicates and cases for which too little information was available, and retaining four projects which were outside the time period, 277 of a potential 1,000 projects remained in the sample. Each project, or case, was

treated as a separate "respondent" (see Appendix A). A case-survey questionnaire was used to collect information on a range of management and related factors from all available documents on each project (see Appendixes B and C). Analysis was performed using the Statistical Analysis System (SAS). Frequencies were calculated for each question on the questionnaire, and potentially useful cross-tabulations were identified. (See Appendix D for a complete description of procedures used in data analysis.)

Cross-tabulation tables were produced to reveal relatively high or low counts of cases for particular paired values for variables such as "success" and "level of project organizational direction." In the cross-tabulations, paired frequencies indicate a potential relationship between the variables. Given the nature of the material in the DIS, however, statistical measures of association were not made. The results herein should, therefore, be interpreted only as signposts pointing to important factors in development management that merit further field testing and more systematic data collection and analysis.

Project designers, implementors, and evaluators may wish to consider certain factors identified here in searching for effective management improvement strategies. Further analysis of the original data could suggest more possibilities for enhancing project success.

Basic documents used as sources for the case survey included project abstracts, logical frameworks, progress reports, audits, and evaluation reports available in the DIS. The questionnaire's emphasis reflects the theoretical orientation of the development management study series. It includes questions on the "level of project organizational direction," "organizational and structural" issues, "administrative process changes," "resource input management," "human resources development and behavioral change," and "contextual factors" affecting management (see Appendix B). These categories of inquiry were selected based on topics identified in development management and public administration literature, extensive field experience and analysis, and a desire to learn more about the relative importance of management strategies, human resources issues, organizational capacities, and the operating context of projects.

4. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE STUDY SAMPLE

Of the 277 projects studied in the sample, 46 percent were in the sectors of food supply, rural development, or nutrition according to standard AID project "purpose" codes. Eighteen percent of the projects were in the education/human resources sector. Health projects represented 9 percent and selected development activities, 12 percent (see Table 1). {3} Use of "functional" codes placed 58 percent of the projects in the agriculture, rural development, and nutrition area; 18 percent

in the education/ human resources functional area; 11 percent in health; and 10 percent in selected development activities. {4} Of the two AID coding systems -- "purpose" and "function" -- the first is primarily used for accounting purposes, and the second is used for budgeting and congressional presentations.

Because priority was given to agricultural and rural development projects in the field studies, the same category of projects is given special importance in the present analysis. The largest number of projects with over \$5 million in funding was in the food production sector. This sector constituted the area of largest investment when combined with funding for rural development and nutrition. Major subgroups of agriculture and rural development projects were agricultural extension, agricultural planning, rural roads, agricultural marketing, vocational/technical education, and professional/scientific education.

The analysis of projects by "primary target" yielded interesting findings (see Table 2). The largest number of projects (38 percent of the 277 projects) were targeted at "government technical personnel," with the "rural population" next at 21 percent. This distribution reflects a conscious effort of seeking to provide benefits to African farmers by improving government institutions that deliver services to them.

This conclusion is supported by an examination of "secondary project targets," where projects are principally targeted at the "rural population" (41 percent) and "government administrators" (12 percent) (see Table 3). The "principal level of organization from which projects were directed" was "national government" (47 percent) followed by "external private voluntary organizations" (14 percent), and "universities" (11 percent) (see Table 4; cf. Table 5).

The largest number of projects in the sample were started between 1977 and 1979 and ended from 1980 to 1983 (see Tables 6a and 6b). The findings, therefore, reflect project problems and strategies used to solve them that were current during that period. The congressional new directions policy, which focused on bringing benefits to the rural poor, and a U.S. recommitment to Africa were two major dimensions reflected in the choice of projects of the period. Because Africa remains a dynamic continent with a variety of contextual factors influencing project orientation, U.S. policy initiatives toward sectors and concerns experience subtle shifts over time. A more complete analysis could be done to compare this group of projects with a comparable group begun in the 1980s to identify new issues and, possibly, new signposts.

The following sections present findings of the analysis. The discussion is only indicative. Other crosstabulations and interrelationships could have been considered. Appendix E has been included to facilitate access to these data for readers who wish to carry the analysis further.

=====

(3)The analytical tables which are the basis for the observations in this report are provided on pages 17-49.

(4)These sectors correspond generally to AID's principal categories as determined by the Congress in the Foreign Assistance Act.

4.1 Level of Project Organizational Direction {5}

A basic question of the original scope of work was to determine the "organizational level from which the development project was directed." It was assumed that management factors would vary according to the level at which responsibility for management decisions is located and that in Africa the level of direction had changed, over time, from a central-government focus to local, rural-level activities. However, in comparing "year of project startup" with "level of organizational direction," it was found that the largest percentage of projects (50 percent) beginning in 1977-1980 were in fact those directed by the national government.

The only other "level of project organizational direction" that seems significant for the 10-year period under study is "universities and institutes," which maintained a steady though modest rate of two project starts per year throughout the period. Projects at other levels of organizational direction, as disaggregated in Table 4, are evenly distributed across the range of years in the sample.

The comparison of "project target" with "principal level of organizational direction" indicates that the largest number of projects was directed toward "agricultural and rural populations," through "technical personnel" in "national government" entities. "Agricultural and rural populations" were, not surprisingly, the principal focus of "external private voluntary organizations," with 35 percent of their projects emphasizing these populations. Other distributions of project targets were not noteworthy except for "agricultural and rural populations" targeted through "universities" and "formal institutions." This can be seen as an attempt to solve rural problems through intermediary institutions. The approach seemed to be that beneficiaries such as rural groups could be assisted through programs that worked directly with national governments that involved service delivery to the rural populations.

A comparison of "project targets" with "project end dates" indicates that many projects ending in 1980-1983 involved rural populations, probably reflecting the congressional new directions mandate of the mid-1970s. For the same period, many projects aimed at "government technical personnel" also were completed. That is, projects in that period were targeted to

bring benefits to rural people through management strategies that involved improving government human resources capacity at the national or regional levels.

When examining "life of project cost" and comparing the figures with "level of project organizational direction," some interesting groupings occur. "National government," for example, is the only "level of project direction" in the sample with funding over \$15 million. The largest concentration of projects is, however, in the \$100,000 to \$3 million range (60 percent). Universities were funded mainly in the \$500,000 to \$1 million range, with no university project over \$10 million. External private voluntary organization projects clustered in the \$100,000 to \$2 million range. The lower level of funding through universities is not what one would intuitively expect given the emphasis discussed above on the creation and improvement of intermediary institutions. This finding should receive further study to determine whether funding-level differences were due to ability in the institutions to handle funds and resources (management capacity) or to program direction choices that favored national government.

=====

(5)The substantive sections of this report follow the outline of the Case Survey Questionnaire, Appendix B, and amplified in the Coding Instructions, Appendix C. The present section of this report relates to question no. 3 of the questionnaire.

4.2 Development Management Enhancement Interventions {6}

The analysis examined "development management enhancement interventions" in the projects and compiled data on "kinds" and "types" of interventions, "success" of the intervention, and "sources of information" for these data. For this study, "enhancement interventions" refers to actions taken to improve the capacity of people and institutions to implement management strategies leading to project success. {7}

The main "kind" of development management enhancement intervention found in the projects was related to "project support" activities (62 percent) (see Table 7). This high rate may be attributable to the fact that project support activities are easily pointed to by project managers as needing improvement. The project support factor also links specific project outputs to intervention strategies. Because few projects have designed a management strategy that can be recognized as such in project documentation, there may be an assumption about support systems aiding project implementation. The data may also be a function of human psychology. People do not often attribute problems to their own actions but, as may have happened here, see outside project support as an area needing improvement.

Some interesting findings show up in examining the

relationships between the "factors" affecting the "intervention strategies" chosen for projects and the "kinds" of groups they were intended to benefit directly or indirectly. "Rural populations," "universities/ schools," and "students," for example, all had problems with the nature of the support activities in their projects. This further reinforces the findings above that people tend to blame others for their own inefficiencies. It may also be linked to perceptions of why management problems occur. Intensive interviewing of personnel would be needed to further identify the kinds of support problems encountered, their relative importance, and how to alleviate them.

For the 138 projects with more than one kind of "management enhancement intervention," there was a wide range of activities toward which the intervention was directed. In 42 percent of these cases, improvement in "administrative processes" was the most prevalent intervention cited (see Table 8). At the other end of the spectrum, "relation to traditional structures" and "development of human resources" each was cited in 8 percent of the projects.

When "kind of intervention" is paired with assessment of project "success," there appears to be a relationship between an intervention that aims at improvement of the "nature of support services" and the overall "success" of the project. Of the cases in the survey, over 50 percent of the "successful" or "somewhat successful" projects had an intervention in the "support services" category. This observation complements the observation that weak support services are an important, real or perceived, project management problem. When action is taken to improve these support services, the project was "successful" or at least "somewhat successful" in over 50 percent of the cases.

Of those cases in which "enhancement interventions" were noted, the main "type" identified was technical assistance (58 percent) followed by training (34 percent) (see Table 9). Because these are AID's main types of intervention, it is not surprising that these interventions should predominate. Of those cases which assessed some form of success of the specific intervention, 29 percent judged the intervention as "successful," 20 percent as "somewhat successful," and only 12 percent as "not very successful" (see Table 10). The most common sources of information for this category of data were Project Appraisal Reports (PAR) and Project Evaluation Summaries (PES), supplying information on 38 percent of the projects, followed by "special evaluation reports," which provided information on 13 percent of the projects (see Table 11).

When considering the secondary {8} type of "management enhancement intervention," "training" comes first in 71 percent of the projects, followed by "technical assistance" at 24 percent (see Table 12). The Project Appraisal Reports and the Project Evaluation Summaries were the principal sources of information on secondary types of management enhancement interventions (36 percent of the 67 relevant cases). "Final

evaluation reports" tie with "special evaluation reports" for the next most useful source of data followed by audit reports (see Table 13). Additional research could be done to analyze the nature of responses from each type of source document for biases among them. This research would help determine which are most reliable sources for program and project decisions when other information is not available and what changes might be useful in these source documents.

When the "level of principal project organizational direction" is compared with the "type" of "management enhancement intervention," there are few surprises. "Technical assistance" and "training" retain their predominant place. When the "level of project organizational direction" is compared with the "kind" of intervention, no statistically significant results are produced. This is probably due to the large number of potential cross-tabulation possibilities (an 18 by 23 matrix). {9}

=====

(6) See question no. 4 of the questionnaire, Appendixes B and C.

(7) It is sometimes necessary to introduce jargon to avoid the misinterpretation that might result from ordinary use of a word. The word "enhancement" was specifically introduced to try to break away from the idea that "training" is the only way to "improve" human and institutional capacities.

(8) The questionnaire used to collect the data for this analysis recognized that projects are not simple activities and that often there is more than one response to a question. In a number of cases, therefore, the coder would be hard-pressed to find one correct response. We therefore permitted the coder to select one "primary" response and, for five of our questions, a "secondary" response.

(9) Since responses to these cross-tabulations are potentially useful for decision-making, it is suggested that the data be retained and combined with further research on this subject.

4.3 Enhancement/Training Component {10}

"Technical assistance" and "training" rank as the two most important "types" of "management enhancement interventions." Presently, AID/Washington appears to be emphasizing training. This section of our analysis, therefore, focuses on this category of data which relates to attempts to improve management capacity of host country personnel through skills training as well as management training. An "enhancement/training" component was reported for 168 projects. Overall, "formal schooling" was the main "method" of "training" in 46 percent of

those cases in which "training" was the principal "type" of "management enhancement" intervention. "On-the-job training" was also important in 19 percent of such cases; "workshop/seminars" method of enhancement was cited in 12 percent of the sample. (See Table 14). Most projects provided training in "contextual" factors (62 percent). "Financial" and "commodity" management training occurred in 12 percent of the cases, and "general management" in 9 percent. (See Table 15.)

Most of the enhancement training was done "in-country" (53 percent of 164 cases); 29 percent of the cases used "U.S." training. "Third-country" training was very minor, with 2 percent of the sample cases. (See Table 16.) This distribution indicates that countries receiving aid are now in a better position to do their own training and are less dependent on the outside.

"Long-term," "degree" training is most frequently cited (29 percent of the cases) as the "duration" of training. This was closely followed by "short-term" training (less than 6 months) (27 percent of the cases). "Long-term," "nondegree" training made up only 10 percent of the sample cases. (See Table 17.) As might be expected from figures above on the "level of project direction," the main "recipients" of training, whatever its "method," "location," or "duration," were "government administrators" (74 percent).

When comparing "level of project direction" with "method of training," "formal schooling" was the "method" most frequently used with projects focused at the "national government" level (23 percent). As one might intuitively expect, projects targeted at university or other school personnel primarily used formal training (77 percent). Training activities designed to enhance support activities also favored the formal schooling method, although to a lesser extent (52 percent), followed by on-the-job training (23 percent) and workshops (14 percent).

In comparing "training method" with "year of project termination," projects ending from 1980 to 1983 preferred formal schooling. Earlier year groupings showed no clear preference for a particular training method. An analysis covering a longer time frame might permit further comparisons that could help explain choices of training methods.

The comparison of "recipients" of training with overall project "success" shows that "government administrators" were the largest group trained in "successful" or "somewhat successful" projects (see Table 32). There is some indication that long-term, degree training and project success are linked. In-country training is also related to success in 57 percent of the projects.

The present findings seem to show that actual emphasis in Africa has been on formal training and not on rural-based instruction. To explain success determinants, however, would require further work, such as extensive interviewing of returned

participants. Finding linkages with their job performance after their return home and analyzing the management environment in which they are working would be helpful.

=====

(10) See question no. 4 of the questionnaire, Appendixes B and C.

4.4 Project Assessment {11}

The analysis looked at project "assessment" ratings and the "type of documents" which were the information source of these assessments. We then compared the "assessments" against other information on the projects. Determining success was particularly important both in selecting projects to be evaluated and as a basis against which to judge the effectiveness of management strategies and enhancement interventions. That is, if a certain intervention was effective in a successful project, there would be some basis for claiming that this was a successful intervention. It certainly would be a "signpost" justifying further study of the circumstances of that project and of the project variables and their relationship to project success.

There is, however, no objective determinant of what is a successful project. The coders who prepared the responses for our questionnaire did not make that determination. They merely recorded what was in the source documents in AID's information system. The main information sources for assessments of our Reports and Project Evaluation Summaries -- (36 percent), and special evaluation reports (10 percent). Interim and final AID evaluations were each the information sources for 5 percent of the projects. Internal AID evaluations, therefore, provided information on 56 percent of the cases. External audits provided data in 5 percent of the cases, and other "unspecified" sources of assessment were indicated in 35 percent of the projects. (See Table 18.) This latter figure represents a large category. It should probably be further disaggregated in a followup study. But internal AID evaluations do seem to be the most important source of information for project performance and lessons learned.

Twenty-nine percent of the 261 cases on which there was information were considered "successful"; another 20 percent were judged "somewhat successful" (see Table 19). The latter category assumes some positive impact on beneficiaries even though the project did not achieve all its objectives. Twelve percent of the projects were considered "not very successful." This last category, plus projects in the "insufficient data" category, made up 51 percent of the 261 cases. This does indicate some weakness in the ability of the AID system to assess project effectiveness.

However, when comparing the two success categories in the survey, "project success" and "intervention success"

corresponded 86 percent of the time. "Somewhat successful interventions" and "somewhat successful projects" corresponded 77 percent of the time. This would seem to indicate a positive relationship between the success of a management intervention action and the success of the project.

In comparing overall project "success" with "method" of "training," some interesting relationships emerge. "Formal schooling," for example, is present in 32 percent of "successful" projects and in 20 percent of "somewhat successful" projects. "Workshops" are part of "successful" projects 47 percent of the time and of "somewhat successful" projects 31 percent of the time. This edge for "informal training" as compared with "formal schooling" should be examined further.

In the area of "skills" training, training in "financial and commodity management" appears to have a strong relationship to project success. This should be examined further in project assessments, particularly because the importance assigned to improvement of financial management in the six field studies showed little direct relationship to project success.

An interesting finding of "success" in relationship to "life-of-project cost" is that more successful projects are in the \$500,000 to \$5 million range. That is, small and large projects have different sets of management problems and, at the moment, smaller projects seem to be better managed.

=====

(11) See question no. 6 of the questionnaire, Appendixes B and C.

4.5 Development Management Problems {12}

This category covers the five main management factors included in the original scope of work for the field studies (i.e., structural, institutional, and organizational factors; improvements in administrative processes; resource input management, particularly financial and commodities resources; human resources development; and contextual factors related to management). {13}

Among "organizational and institutional" subfactors, the "nature of project support services" was the most predominant management problem (in 55 percent of 254 cases). This statistic corresponds to the importance attributed to project support services in the discussion above on management enhancement interventions. The next important subfactor, although with a much lower absolute number, was the "relationship of the project to beneficiaries." This was identified as a management problem in 9 percent of the cases. (See Table 20.)

A wide range of "administrative process" problems was identified. These included "insufficient authority" to manage the project (14 percent of 242 cases); "insufficient

decision-making ability," even when project managers had the appropriate authority (10 percent); "inadequate or incomplete project planning" (11 percent); and "insufficient coordination between government and donors" (5 percent) (see Table 21).

In relating these "administrative process" problems to "project targets," certain issues were raised as potential areas for closer scrutiny. Consider the following findings:

- o Projects targeting rural populations, rather than, for example, more formal organizations and associations, experienced more project staff coordination problems and donor/government coordination problems.
- o Projects targeting government technical personnel experienced problems with insufficient authority to manage, particularly insufficient authority to make management decisions.
- o Projects targeting rural populations had problems with inadequate program planning, perhaps because such projects were more difficult to implement.
- o Projects targeting government technical personnel had problems not only with program planning, but also with coordination among government agencies and between government and donors.

The third major set of management problems dealt with "financial" and "commodity" and other resource management issues. In 239 of the cases with data, financial management problems were those related to long-term financial planning (10 percent) and accounting (8 percent). Commodity problems included purchasing procedures and proper timing and availability of commodities. (See Table 22.) When "financial management problems" are compared with "project targets," the following relationships appear:

- o Rural population projects appear to have more problems with budgeting and construction.
- o Projects targeting students have problems with simple accounting.
- o Projects targeting government technical personnel have problems with long-term financial planning, timing of commodity arrival, operational budgeting, and accounting.

Comparing "level of organizational direction" with "financial management problems" shows the following:

- o Projects managed by national government entities have problems with long-term financial planning, budgeting,

accounting, timing and availability of commodities, inventory, and purchasing and construction.

- o Universities have problems with operational budgeting and accounting.
- o External private voluntary organizations have problems with long-term financial planning, accounting, and construction.

These relationships seem to indicate that simpler projects at the rural level have less severe financial management problems. The situation becomes more complicated as one moves up the organizational hierarchy to universities and to the national government.

The fourth major area of inquiry relates to "human resources management problems," particularly to enhancement of the capacity of government cadre to perform well. The study confirmed that ensuring the availability of competent, experienced project cadre on a continuing basis was an important human resources issue (see Table 23). It is concluded, however, that most of the issues in this management area can only be understood through in-depth interviewing of project personnel, beneficiaries, and key decision-makers rather than through the use of a research questionnaire. The reader, therefore, should review the six field case studies that are part of this evaluation exercise for a better understanding of human resources management issues.

The fifth major management area of inquiry relates to "contextual factors." Of the list proposed in the research questionnaire, problems related to "sociocultural" conditions seemed to be most important. Other problems included nature of "project technology"; "donor procedures"; "external economic factors"; "basic project complexity"; and "geographic and climatic" problems in the project zone (see Table 24). There were 245 responses to this set of management factors indicating its relative importance in the documentation.

=====

(12) See question no. 7 of the questionnaire, Appendixes B and C.

(13) The reader should note that as a result of this analysis, the field studies, and the syntheses which followed, CDIE is proposing that AID use a slightly different framework of management factors. This analysis of the management factors from the original scope of work will be useful should the analysis be carried into another geographic region.

Table 1. Purpose Codes for Project Classification,
by Frequency and Percentage

Project Purpose	Codea	Frequency	Percentage
Mixed Code.....	--	17	6.13
Food Supply.....	100	83	29.96
Rural Development.....	200	39	14.07
Nutrition.....	300	6	2.16
Population.....	400	10	3.61
Health.....	500	25	9.02
Education/Human Resources.....	600	49	17.69
Selected Development			
Activities.....	700	34	12.27
Special Assistance.....	900	14	5.05
Total Projects.....		277	100.00

For a complete list of codes see AID Handbook 18, Appendix D, April 2, 1979.

Table 2. Primary Targets of Projects,
by Frequency and Percentage

Primary Project Target	Frequency	Percentage
Population at Large		
Population at Large -- Undefined.....	18	6.56
Agriculturalists/Rural Population.....	58	21.16
Businesspersons/Professionals.....	7	2.55
Students.....	19	6.93
Women.....	7	2.55
Subtotal.....	(109)	(39.78)
Organization/Association Cadre		
Organization/Association Cadre--		
Undefined.....	1	0.36
Government Administrators.....	1	0.36
Nongovernment Administrators.....	6	2.19
Government -- Technical.....	103	37.59
Nongovernment -- Technical.....	3	1.09
Faculty.....	23	8.39
Other Organizational Cadre.....	1	0.36
Subtotal.....	(138)	(50.36)
Senior Managers/Executives/Leaders		
Public Sector Managers.....	8	2.92

Private Sector Managers.....	4	1.46
Subtotal.....	(12)	(4.38)
Insufficient Data.....	15	5.47
Total Responses.....	274	100.00
None.....	3	
Total Projects.....	277	

Table 3. Secondary Targets of Projects,
by Frequency and Percentage

Secondary Project Target	Frequency	Percentage
Population at Large		
Population at Large -- Undefined.....	2	2.94
Agriculturalists/Rural Population.....	28	41.17
Businesspersons/Professionals.....	4	5.88
Students.....	6	8.82
Women.....	2	2.94
Subtotal.....	(42)	(61.76)
Organization/Association Cadre		
Government Administrators.....	8	11.76
Nongovernment Administrators.....	2	2.94
Government -- Technical.....	6	8.82
Nongovernment -- Technical.....	1	1.47
Faculty.....	3	4.41
Subtotal.....	(20)	(29.41)
Senior Managers/Executives/Leaders		
Public Sector Managers.....	4	5.88
Private Sector Managers.....	1	1.47
Subtotal.....	(5)	(7.35)
Insufficient Data.....	1	1.47
Total Responses.....	68	100.00
None.....	209	
Total Projects.....	277	

Table 4. Principal Level of Project Organizational Direction,
by Frequency and Percentage

Principal Level of Organizational Direction	Frequency	Percentage
Formal Government		
Formal Government -- Undefined.....	2	0.73
National Government.....	128	46.71
Decentralized National Government.....	7	2.55
State/Provincial Government.....	5	1.82
Subprovince/Municipal Government.....	4	1.46
Subtotal.....	(146)	(53.28)
Semi-Government		
Parastatal Organization.....	14	5.10
Separate Authority.....	9	3.28
University/School.....	31	11.31
Bank.....	3	1.09
Subtotal.....	(57)	(20.80)
Semi-Private Sector		
Indigenous PVO.....	9	3.28
External PVO.....	37	13.50
Cooperative/Association.....	6	2.19
Subtotal.....	(52)	(18.98)
Private Sector		
International Private Sector.....	2	0.73
Local Private Sector.....	1	0.36
Subtotal.....	(3)	(1.09)
Traditional Groups		
Pastoral/Nomadic Groups.....	1	0.36
Village/Settlements.....	1	0.36
Subtotal.....	(2)	(0.73)
Other.....	1	0.36
Insufficient Data.....	13	4.74
Total Responses.....	274	100.00
None.....	3	
Total Projects.....	277	

Table 5. Secondary Level of Project Organizational Direction,
by Frequency and Percentage

Secondary Level of Organizational Directiona	Frequency	Percentage
State/Provincial Government.....	3	18.75
Separate Authority.....	1	6.25
University/School.....	1	6.25
Indigenous PVO.....	1	6.25
External PVO.....	2	12.50
Cooperative/Association.....	7	43.75
Village/Settlements.....	1	6.25
Total Responses.....	16	100.00
None.....	261	
Total Projects.....	277	

See Table 4 for a more complete listing of levels. Lines were omitted in Table 5 where there were no responses.

Table 6a. Fiscal Year of Project Start,
by Frequency and Percentage

Start	Frequency	Percentage
1959	1	0.36
1960	4	1.44
1961	1	0.36
1962	3	1.08
1963	3	1.08
1964	6	2.17
1965	8	2.89
1966	3	1.08
1967	1	0.36
1968	2	0.72
1969	6	2.17
1970	12	4.34
1971	16	5.79
1972	9	3.26
1973	12	4.34
1974	6	2.17
1975	23	8.33
1976	22	7.97

1977	35	12.68
1978	47	17.02
1979	31	11.23
1980	17	6.15
1981	6	2.17
1982	2	0.72
Total Responses	276	100.00
Uncertain	1	
Total Projects	277	

Table 6b. Fiscal Year of Project End,
by Frequency and Percentage

End	Frequency	Percentage
1975	27	9.78
1976	14	5.07
1977	16	5.79
1978	17	6.15
1979	18	6.52
1980	30	10.87
1981	35	12.68
1982	55	19.92
1983	53	19.20
1984	7	2.53
1985a	2	0.72
1986a	2	0.72
Total Responses	276	100.00
Uncertain	1	
Total Projects	277	

These four projects outside the 10-year sample survey period were discovered at the end of the study. They will have only a small effect on that portion of the study making annual comparisons.

Table 7. Primary Kind of Development Management Enhancement
Intervention, by Frequency and Percentage

Kind	Frequency	Percentage
Structural/Organizational/ Institutional		
Structural/Organizational/ Institutional -- Undefined.....	8	4.57
Relation of Project to Higher Authorities.....	2	1.14
Relation of Project to Beneficiaries.....	6	3.42
Relation of Project to Government Agencies.....	1	0.57
Nature of Project Support Activities.....	109	62.28
Relation of Project to Traditional Structures.....	3	1.71
Relation of Project to Donors.....	1	0.57
Subtotal	(130)	(74.28)
Improvements in Administrative Processes		
Improvements in Administrative Processes -- Undefined.....	7	4.00
Monitoring/Evaluation.....	2	1.14
Subtotal.....	(9)	(5.14)
Financial and Commodity Management		
Improved Financial and Commodity Management.....	5	2.85
Financial Management.....	3	1.71
Subtotal.....	(8)	(4.76)
Human Resources Management		
Improved Human Resources Management....	2	1.14
Beneficiaries.....	1	0.57
Cadre.....	2	1.14
Managers and Leaders.....	1	0.57
Other.....	1	0.57
Subtotal.....	(7)	(3.99)
Contextual Factors		
Capabilities of Foreign Technicians....	1	0.57
Sociocultural Factors.....	1	0.57
Political Factors.....	1	0.57
Subtotal.....	(3)	(1.71)
Other.....	6	3.42
Insufficient Data.....	12	6.85
Total Responses.....	175	100.00
None.....	102	
Total Projects.....	277	

****END OF SECTION****

Table 8. Secondary Kind of Development Management Enhancement Intervention, by Frequency and Percentage

Kind	Frequency	Percentage
Structural/Organizational/ Institutional		
Structural/Organizational/ Institutional -- Undefined.....	1	0.72
Relation of Project to Beneficiaries.....	8	5.79
Relation of Project to Government Agencies.....	9	6.52
Nature of Project Support Activities.....	3	2.17
Relation of Project to Traditional Structures.....	11	7.97
Relation of Project to Donors.....	3	2.17
Subtotal	(35)	(25.36)
Improvements in Administrative Processes		
Improvements in Administrative Processes...	58	42.02
Planning.....	1	0.72
Monitoring/Evaluation.....	2	1.44
Communication and Dissemination.....	3	2.17
Subtotal.....	(64)	(46.38)
Financial and Commodity Management		
Improved Financial and Commodity Management.....	7	5.07
Financial Management.....	2	1.44
Commodity Management.....	6	4.34
Subtotal.....	(15)	(10.87)
Human Resources Management		
Improved Human Resources Management.....	3	2.17
Beneficiaries.....	5	3.62
Cadre.....	11	7.97
Managers and Leaders.....	1	0.72
Subtotal.....	(20)	(14.49)
Contextual Factors		
Changes in Contextual Factors Related to Management.....	1	0.72
Capabilities of Foreign Technicians.....	1	0.72
Sociocultural Factors.....	1	0.72
Technology.....	1	0.72
Subtotal.....	(4)	(2.90)

Total Responses.....	138	100.00
None.....	139	
Total Projects.....	277	

Table 9. Primary Type of Development Management Enhancement Intervention, by Frequency and Percentage

Type	Frequency	Percentage
Technical Assistance.....	100	58.14
Training.....	59	34.30
Direct Management.....	3	1.74
Financial Transfer.....	1	0.58
Other.....	3	1.74
Insufficient Data.....	6	3.48
Total Responses.....	172	100.00
None.....	105	
Total Projects.....	277	

Table 10. Degree of Success of Primary Type of Development Management Enhancement Intervention, by Frequency and Percentage

Degree of Success	Frequency	Percentage
Not Very Successful.....	19	11.65
Somewhat Successful.....	32	19.63
Successful.....	48	29.44
Insufficient Data.....	64	39.26
Total Responses.....	163	100.00
None.....	114	
Total Projects.....	277	

Table 11. Source Document for Primary Type of

Development Management Enhancement Intervention,
by Frequency and Percentage

Document	Frequency	Percentage
PAR or PES.....	60	38.46
Special Evaluation Report.....	20	12.82
Interim/Progress Report.....	7	4.48
Final Report.....	16	10.25
Audit Report.....	5	3.20
Other.....	43	27.56
Insufficient Data.....	5	3.20
Total Responses.....	156	100.00
None.....	121	
Total Projects.....	277	

Table 12. Secondary Type of Development Management
Enhancement Intervention, by Frequency and Percentage

Type	Frequency	Percentage
Technical Assistance.....	31	23.48
Training.....	94	71.21
Direct Management.....	1	0.76
Financial Transfer.....	4	3.03
Insufficient Data.....	1	0.76
	1	0.76
Total Responses.....	132	100.00
None.....	145	
Total Projects.....	277	

Table 13. Source Document for Secondary Type of
Development Management Enhancement Intervention,
by Frequency and Percentage

Document	Frequency	Percentage
PAR or PES.....	24	35.82
Special Evaluation Report.....	11	16.42
Interim/Progress Report.....	3	4.48
Final Report.....	11	16.42
Audit Report.....	10	14.93

Other.....	5	7.46
Insufficient Data.....	3	4.48
Total Responses.....	67	100.00
None.....	210	
Total Projects.....	277	

Table 14. Enhancement/Training Method,
by Frequency and Percentage

Method	Frequency	Percentage
Formal Schooling.....	78	46.43
Special Institute.....	6	3.57
Workshops/Seminars/Conferences.....	20	11.90
On-the-Job.....	32	19.05
Process Learning.....	3	1.79
Mass Media.....	1	0.60
Other.....	2	1.19
Insufficient Data.....	26	15.48
Total Responses.....	168	100.00
None.....	109	
Total Projects.....	277	

Table 15. Enhancement/Training Skill Area,
by Frequency and Percentage

Skill Area	Frequency	Percentage
Structural/Organizational Management.....	2	1.18
Administrative Management.....	4	2.35
Financial/Commodities Management....	20	11.76
Human Resources Management.....	3	1.76
Contextual Factors Related to Management.....	106	62.35
General or Multiple Area Management.....	16	9.41
Other.....	3	1.76
Insufficient Data.....	16	9.41
Total Responses.....	170	100.00
None.....	107	

Total Projects..... 277

Table 16. Enhancement/Training Location,
by Frequency and Percentage

Location	Frequency	Percentage
In-country.....	87	53.04
United States.....	48	29.26
Third Country.....	4	2.43
Other.....	1	0.60
Insufficient Data.....	24	14.63
Total Responses.....	164	100.00
None.....	113	
Total Projects.....	277	

Table 17. Enhancement/Training Duration,
by Frequency and Percentage

Duration	Frequency	Percentage
Short Term (less than 6 mo.).....	38	26.95
Long Term -- nondegree.....	14	9.92
Long Term -- degree.....	41	29.07
Other.....	1	0.70
Insufficient Data.....	47	33.33
Total Responses.....	141	100.00
None.....	136	
Total Projects.....	277	

Table 18. Information Source for Project Assessment,
by Frequency and Percentage

Source	Frequency	Percentage
PAR or PES.....	97	35.92
Special Evaluation Report.....	27	10.00
Interim/Progress Report.....	12	4.44
Final Report.....	15	5.55
Audit Report.....	13	4.81

Other.....	95	35.18
Insufficient Data.....	11	4.07
Total Responses.....	270	100.00
None.....	7	
Total Projects.....	277	

Table 19. Assessment of Project Success,
by Frequency and Percentage

Success	Frequency	Percentage
Not Very Successful.....	31	11.87
Somewhat Successful.....	51	19.54
Successful.....	75	28.73
Insufficient Data.....	104	39.84
Total Responses.....	261	100.00
None.....	16	
Total Projects.....	277	

Table 20. Primary Development Management Problems:
Structural/Organizational,
by Frequency and Percentage

Problem	Frequency	Percentage
Structural/Organizational-- Undefined.....	4	1.57
Relationship of Project to Higher Authorities.....	9	3.54
Relationship of Project to Beneficiaries.....	23	9.05
Relationship of Project to Government Agencies.....	17	6.69
Nature of Project Support Services.....	139	54.72
Relation of Project to Traditional Structures.....	10	3.93
Relation of Project to Donors.....	10	3.93
Continuing Host Government Support After Project End.....	1	0.39
Other Organizational or Structural.....	2	0.78
Other.....	4	1.57
Insufficient Data.....	35	13.77
Total Responses.....	254	100.00
None.....	23	

Total Projects..... 277

Table 21. Primary Development Management Problems:
Administrative Processes,
by Frequency and Percentage

Problem	Frequency	Percentage
Administrative Processes--		
Undefined.....	2	0.82
Authority and Decision-Making--		
Undefined.....	3	1.24
Insufficient Authority/Actions to		
Improve.....	35	14.46
Insufficient Decision-Making		
Ability/Processes.....	25	10.33
Insufficient Delegation of		
Authority.....	5	2.06
Coordination -- Undefined.....	4	1.65
Insufficient Coordination Among		
Project Staff.....	22	9.09
Insufficient Coordination Among		
Government Agencies.....	22	9.09
Insufficient Coordination Between		
Government and Donors.....	14	5.78
Inadequate/Incomplete Program		
Planning.....	26	10.74
Inadequate/Incomplete Monitoring/		
Evaluation.....	3	1.24
Inadequate/Incomplete Data		
Collection/Reporting.....	12	4.95
Inadequate/Incomplete		
Communication/Dissemination.....	7	2.89
Other.....	4	1.65
Insufficient Data.....	58	23.96
Total Responses.....	242	100.00
None.....	35	
Total Projects.....	277	

Table 22. Primary Development Management Problems:
Financial and Commodities Management,
by Frequency and Percentage

Problem	Frequency	Percentage
---------	-----------	------------

Financial Management Problems		
Financial Problems -- Undefined.....	4	1.67
Long-Term Financial Planning.....	24	10.04
Inadequate Operational Budgeting.....	16	6.69
Insufficient Local Currency.....	7	2.92
Insufficient Foreign Exchange.....	2	0.83
Timing/Availability.....	7	2.92
Accounting.....	21	8.78
Information/Reporting.....	6	2.51
Subtotal.....	(87)	(36.40)
Commodity Management Problems		
Commodities Problems -- Undefined.....	1	0.41
Long-Term Planning (Commodities).....	4	1.67
Timing and Availability (Commodities)...	17	7.11
Inventory and Warehousing.....	10	4.18
Purchasing Procedures, Authority, Approval.....	16	6.69
End Use.....	12	5.02
Maintenance.....	3	1.25
Subtotal.....	(63)	(26.35)
Construction Management Problems.....	18	7.53
Subtotal.....	(18)	7.53
Other.....	5	2.08
Insufficient Data.....	66	27.61
Total Responses.....	239	100
None.....	38	
Total Projects.....	277	

Table 23. Primary Management Problems:
Human Resources Management,
by Frequency and Percentage

Problems	Frequency	Percentage
Beneficiaries		
Beneficiaries -- Undefined.....	6	2.44
Participation in Planning/ Implementation.....	6	2.44
Attitude Toward Project.....	27	11.02
Skills/Performance Enhancement.....	14	5.71
Subtotal.....	(53)	(21.63)
Cadre		
Cadre -- Undefined.....	4	1.63
Understanding of Project Purpose.....	1	0.40
Availability and Project Turnover.....	23	9.38
Competence/Experience.....	20	8.16

Motivation/Attitude Toward Project Goals	5	2.04
Conditions of Employment.....	4	1.63
Skills/Performance Enhancement.....	46	18.77
Subtotal..... (103)		(42.04)
Managers/Leaders		
Managers/Leaders -- Undefined.....	2	0.81
Understanding of Project Purpose.....	2	0.81
Availability and Turnover.....	3	1.22
Competence/Experience.....	6	2.44
Motivation/Attitude Toward Project Goals	5	2.04
Conditions of Employment.....	1	0.40
Performance.....	1	0.40
Subtotal..... (20)		(8.16)
Other Problems		
Other Human Resources Problems -- Undefined	1	
Organization/Use of Internal Staff		0.40
Services.....	9	3.67
Interpersonal Relationships.....	1	0.40
Subtotal..... (11)		(4.48)
Quality Factors		
Timeliness.....	1	0.40
Quality of Training Staff.....	1	0.40
Other Quality Factors.....	2	0.81
Subtotal..... (4)		(1.63)
Other.....	7	2.85
Insufficient Data.....	47	19.18
Total Responses.....	245	100
None.....	32	
Total Projects.....	277	

Table 24. Primary Development Management Problems:
Contextual Factors,
by Frequency and Percentage

Problem	Frequency	Percentage
Capabilities of Foreign Technicians.....	24	9.79
Donor Procedures -- Undefined.....	20	8.16
Donor Procedures -- Planning.....	6	2.44
Donor Procedures -- Implementation.....	10	4.08
Donor Procedures -- Finance.....	2	0.81
Relation of Donor Managers to		
Counterparts.....	4	1.63
Sociocultural Factors.....	34	13.87
Political Factors.....	8	3.26
Economic Factors.....	21	8.57
Basic Project Design/Complexity.....	18	7.34

Policy Differences During Implementation.	4	1.63
Geography/Climate in Project Area.....	17	6.93
Project Technology.....	32	13.06
Other.....	10	4.08
Insufficient Data.....	35	14.28
Total Responses.....	245	100
None.....	32	
Total Projects.....	277	

Table 25. Purpose Compared to Life-of-Project Cost,
by Frequency and Percentage

Life-of-Project Cost (\$1,000s)								
Purpose	0- 100	101- 500	501- 1,000	1,001- 2,000	2,001- 3,000	3,001- 4,000	4,001- 5,000	
Mixed Code								
Frequency	0	1	2	4	2	1	1	
Percentage	0.00	0.36	0.72	1.44	0.72	0.36	0.36	
Row %	0.00	5.88	11.76	23.53	11.76	5.88	5.88	
Column %	0.00	1.72	5.13	8.33	6.67	6.25	5.26	
Food Supply								
Frequency	3	10	9	16	10	6	8	
Percentage	1.08	3.61	3.25	5.78	3.61	2.17	2.89	
Row %	3.61	12.05	10.84	19.28	12.05	7.23	9.64	
Column %	30.00	17.24	23.08	33.33	33.33	37.50	42.11	
Rural Development								
Frequency	3	8	7	5	3	4	3	
Percentage	1.08	2.89	2.53	1.81	1.08	1.44	1.08	
Row %	7.69	20.51	17.95	12.82	7.69	10.26	7.69	
Column %	30.00	13.79	17.95	10.42	10.00	25.00	15.79	
Nutrition								
Frequency	0	5	0	1	0	0	0	
Percentage	0.00	1.81	0.00	0.36	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Row %	0.00	83.33	0.00	16.67	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Column %	0.00	8.62	0.00	2.08	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Population								
Frequency	0	0	2	4	2	0	0	
Percentage	0.00	0.00	0.72	1.44	0.72	0.00	0.00	
Row %	0.00	0.00	20.00	40.00	20.00	0.00	0.00	

Column %	0.00	0.00	5.13	8.33	6.67	0.00	0.00
----------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------

Health

Frequency	0	6	5	7	5	1	0
Percentage	0.00	2.17	1.81	2.53	1.81	0.36	0.00
Row %	0.00	24.00	20.00	28.00	20.00	4.00	0.00
Column %	0.00	10.34	12.82	14.58	16.67	6.25	0.00

Education/Human Resources

Frequency	1	15	7	8	3	2	3
Percentage	0.36	5.42	2.53	2.89	1.08	0.72	1.08
Row %	2.04	30.61	14.29	16.33	6.12	4.08	6.12
Column %	10.00	25.86	17.95	16.67	10.00	12.50	15.79

Selected Development Activities

Frequency	1	11	5	2	3	1	2
Percentage	0.36	3.97	1.81	0.72	1.08	0.36	0.72
Row %	2.94	32.35	14.71	5.88	8.82	2.94	5.88
Column %	10.00	18.97	12.82	4.17	10.00	6.25	10.53

Special Assistance

Frequency	2	2	2	1	2	1	2
Percentage	0.72	0.72	0.72	0.36	0.72	0.36	0.72
Row %	14.29	14.29	14.29	7.14	14.29	7.14	14.29
Column %	20.00	3.45	5.13	2.08	6.67	6.25	10.53

Total Frequency	10	58	39	48	30	16	
Percentage	3.61	20.94	14.08	17.33	10.83	5.78	6.86
Column %	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Life-of-Project Cost (\$1,000s)

	5,000-	6,001-	7,001-	8,001-	9,001-	10,001-	Over	
Purpose	6,000	7,000	8,000	9,000	10,000	14,000	15,000	Total

Mixed Code

Frequency	2	1	1	1	0	0	1	17
Percentage	0.72	0.36	0.36	0.36	0.00	0.00	0.36	6.14
Row %	11.76	5.88	5.88	5.88	0.00	0.00	5.88	100.00
Column %	18.18	12.50	14.29	25.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	-

Food Supply

Frequency	3	3	1	2	2	6	4	83
Percentage	1.08	1.08	0.36	0.72	0.72	2.17	1.44	29.96
Row %	3.61	3.61	1.20	2.41	2.41	7.23	4.82	100.00
Column %	27.27	37.50	14.29	50.00	28.57	60.00	40.00	-

Rural Development

Frequency	1	2	1	0	0	1	1	39	
Percentage	0.36	0.72	0.36	0.00	0.00	0.36	0.36	14.00	
Row %	2.56	5.13	2.56	0.00	0.00	2.56	2.56	100.00	
Column %	9.09	25.00	14.29	0.00	0.00	10.00	10.00	-	

Nutrition

Frequency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	
Percentage	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.17	
Row %	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	
Column %	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	-	

Population

Frequency	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	10	
Percentage	0.00	0.36	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.36	0.00	3.61	
Row %	0.00	10.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	0.00	100.00	
Column %	0.00	12.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	0.00	-	

Health

Frequency	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	25	
Percentage	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.36	9.03	
Row %	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.00	100.00	
Column %	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	-	

Education/Human Resources

Frequency	3	0	3	0	3	1	0	49	
Percentage	1.08	0.00	1.08	0.00	1.08	0.36	0.00	17.69	
Row %	6.12	0.00	6.12	0.00	6.12	2.04	0.00	100.00	
Column %	27.27	0.00	42.86	0.00	42.86	10.00	0.00	-	

Selected Development Activities

Frequency	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	34	
Percentage	0.72	0.36	0.36	0.36	0.36	0.36	0.72	12.27	
Row %	5.88	2.94	2.94	2.94	2.94	2.94	5.88	100.00	
Column %	18.18	12.50	14.29	25.00	14.29	10.00	20.00	-	

Special Assistance

Frequency	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	14	
Percentage	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.36	0.00	0.36	5.05	
Row %	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	7.14	0.00	7.14	100.00	
Column %	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	14.29	0.00	10.00	-	

Total

Frequency	11	8	7	4	7	10	10	277	
Percentage	3.97	2.89	2.53	1.44	2.53	3.61	3.61	100.00	
Column %	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	-

Table 26. Purpose Compared to Success,
by Frequency and Percentage

Degree of Success

Purpose	Not Nonea	Somewhat Successful	Insufficient Successful	Total Data	Responses
---------	--------------	------------------------	----------------------------	---------------	-----------

Nonea

Frequency	(1)	2	3	5	6	16
Percentage	-	0.77	1.15	1.92	2.30	6.13
Row %	-	12.50	18.75	31.25	37.50	100.00
Column %	-	6.45	5.88	6.67	5.77	-

Food Supply

Frequency	(6)	12	24	15	26	77
Percentage	-	4.60	9.20	5.75	9.96	29.50
Row %	-	15.58	31.17	19.48	33.77	100.00
Column %	-	38.71	47.06	20.00	25.00	-

Rural Development

Frequency	(2)	8	5	13	11	37
Percentage	-	3.07	1.92	4.98	4.21	14.18
Row %	-	21.62	13.51	35.14	29.73	100.00
Column %	-	25.81	9.80	17.33	10.58	-

Nutrition

Frequency	0	0	2	2	2	6
Percentage	-	0.00	0.77	0.77	0.77	2.30
Row %	-	0.00	33.33	33.33	33.33	100.00
Column %	-	0.00	3.92	2.67	1.92	-

Population

Frequency	(1)	3	1	5	0	9
Percentage	-	1.15	0.38	1.92	0.00	3.45
Row %	-	33.33	11.11	55.56	0.00	100.00
Column %	-	9.68	1.96	6.67	0.00	-

Health

Frequency	(1)	2	4	11	7	24
Percentage	-	0.77	1.53	4.21	2.68	9.20
Row %	-	8.33	16.67	45.83	29.17	100.00
Column %	-	6.45	7.84	14.67	6.73	-

Education/Human Resources

Frequency	(2)	3	8	13	23	47
Percentage	-	1.15	3.07	4.98	8.81	18.01
Row %	-	6.38	17.02	27.66	48.94	100.00
Column %	-	9.68	15.69	17.33	22.12	-

Selected Development Activities

Frequency	(3)	1	3	10	17	31
Percentage	-	0.38	1.15	3.83	6.51	11.88
Row %	-	3.23	9.68	32.26	54.84	100.00
Column %	-	3.23	5.88	13.33	16.35	-

Special Assistance

Frequency	0	0	1	1	12	14
Percentage	-	0.00	0.38	0.38	4.60	5.36
Row %	-	0.00	7.14	7.14	85.71	100.00
Column %	-	0.00	1.96	1.33	11.54	-

Total

Frequency	(16)	31	51	75	104	261
Percentage	-	11.88	19.54	28.74	39.85	100.00
Column %		100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	-

Not included in total responses; total projects remain at 277.

Table 27. Primary Project Target Compared to Success, by Frequency and Percentage

Degree of Success

Target	Not Very		Insufficient		Total	Responses
	Nonea	Successful	Successfulb		Data	

Nonea

Frequency	(1)	0	2	0	2
Percentage	-	0.00	76	00.0	0.76
Row %	-	0.00	100.00	00.0	100.00
Column %	-	-	1.58	-	-

Population at Large

Frequency	(2)	1	4	11	16
Percentage	-	0.38	1.53	4.21	6.13
Row %	-	6.25	25.00	68.75	100.00
Column %	-	3.23	3.17	10.58	-

Agriculturalists/Rural Population

Frequency	(3)	9	28	18	55
Percentage	-	3.44	10.73	6.90	21.07
Row %	-	16.36	50.91	32.73	100.00
Column %	-	29.03	22.22	17.31	-

Business-persons/Professionals

Frequency	0	1	5	1	7
Percentage	-	0.38	1.92	0.34	2.68
Row %	-	14.29	71.43	14.29	100.00
Column %	-	3.23	3.96	0.96	-

Students

Frequency	(1)	2	7	9	18
Percentage	-	0.76	2.68	3.45	6.90
Row %	-	11.11	38.89	50.00	100.00
Column %	-	6.45	5.55	8.65	-

Women

Frequency	0	0	4	3	7
Percentage	-	0.00	1.53	1.15	2.68
Row %	-	0.00	57.14	42.86	100.00
Column %	-	0.00	3.17	2.88	-

Organization/Association Cadre

Frequency	0	0	1	0	1
Percentage	-	0.00	0.38	0.00	0.38
Row %	-	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00
Column %	-	0.00	0.79	0.00	-

Government Administrators

Frequency	0	0	0	1	1
Percentage	-	0.00	0.00	0.38	0.38
Row %	-	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00
Column %	-	0.00	0.00	0.96	-

Nongovernment Administrators

Frequency	(1)	0	5	0	5
Percentage	-	0.00	1.92	0.00	1.92
Row %	-	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00
Column %	-	0.00	3.96	0.00	-

Government--Technical

Frequency	(6)	13	51	33	97
Percentage	-	4.98	19.54	12.64	37.16
Row %	-	13.40	52.58	34.02	100.00
Column %	-	41.94	40.48	31.73	-

Nongovernment -- Technical

Frequency	0	1	1	1	3
Percentage	-	0.38	0.38	0.38	1.14
Row %	-	33.33	33.33	33.33	100.00
Column %	-	3.23	0.79	0.96	-

Faculty

Frequency	0	3	12	8	23
Percentage	-	1.15	4.60	3.07	8.81
Row %	-	13.04	52.17	34.78	100.00
Column %	-	9.68	9.52	7.69	-

Other Organizations

Frequency	0	1	0	0	1
Percentage	-	0.38	0.00	0.00	0.38
Row %	-	100.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
Column %	-	3.23	0.00	0.00	-

Public Sector Managers

Frequency	0	0	4	4	8
Percentage	-	0.00	1.53	1.53	3.07
Row %	-	0.00	50.00	50.00	100.00
Column %	-	0.00	3.17	3.85	-

Private Sector Managers

Frequency	(1)	0	2	1	3
Percentage	-	0.00	0.76	0.38	1.14
Row %	-	0.00	66.67	33.33	100.00
Column %	-	0.00	1.58	0.96	-

Insufficient Data

Frequency	(1)	0	0	14	14
Percentage	-	0.00	0.00	5.41	5.36
Row %	-	0.00	0.00	100.00	-
Column %	-	0.00	0.00	13.46	-

Total

Frequency	(16)	31	126	104	261
Percentage	-	11.87	48.27	39.84	100.00
Column %	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	-

Not included in total responses; total projects remain at 277.

"Somewhat successful" and "successful" categories have been combined into one column.

Table 28. Principal Level of Project Organizational Direction
Compared to Success, by Frequency and Percentage

Degree of Success				
Nonea	Not Very Successful	Successfulb	Insufficient Data	Total Direction Responses

Nonea

Frequency	(2)	0	1	0	1
Percentage	-	-	38	-	-
Row %	-	-	100.00	-	100.00
Column %	-	-	.80	-	-

Formal Government

Frequency	0	1	0	1	2
Percentage	-	0.38	0.00	0.38	0.77
Row %	-	50.00	0.00	50.00	100.00
Column %	-	3.23	0.00	0.96	-

National Government

Frequency	(5)	15	55	53	123
Percentage	-	5.77	21.15	20.38	47.31
Row %	-	12.20	44.72	43.09	100.00
Column %	-	48.39	44.00	50.96	-

Decentralized National Government

Frequency	0	3	3	1	7
Percentage	-	1.15	1.15	0.38	2.69
Row %	-	42.86	42.86	14.29	100.00
Column %	-	9.68	2.40	0.96	-

State/Provincial Government

Frequency	0	1	1	3	5
Percentage	-	0.38	0.38	1.15	1.92
Row %	-	20.00	20.00	60.00	100.00
Column %	-	3.23	0.80	2.88	-

Subprovince/Municipal Government

Frequency	(1)	1	2	0	3
Percentage	-	0.38	0.77	0.00	1.15
Row %	-	33.33	66.67	0.00	100.00
Column %	-	3.23	1.60	0.00	-

Parastatal Organization

Frequency	0	3	7	4	14
Percentage	-	1.15	2.69	1.54	5.38
Row %	-	21.43	50.00	28.57	100.00
Column %	-	9.68	5.60	3.85	-

Separate Authority

Frequency	0	1	5	3	9
Percentage	-	0.38	1.92	1.15	3.46
Row %	-	11.11	55.56	33.33	100.00
Column %	-	3.23	4.00	2.88	-

University/School

Frequency	(1)	2	18	10	30
Percentage	-	0.77	6.92	3.85	11.54
Row %	-	6.67	60.00	33.33	100.00
Column %	-	6.45	14.40	9.62	-

Bank

Frequency	0	0	3	0	3
Percentage	-	0.00	1.15	0.00	1.15
Row %	-	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00
Column %	-	0.00	2.40	0.00	-

Indigenous PVO

Frequency	0	0	8	1	9
Percentage	-	0.00	3.08	0.38	3.46
Row %	-	0.00	88.89	11.11	100.00
Column %	-	0.00	6.40	0.96	-

External PVO

Frequency	(2)	3	18	14	35
Percentage	-	1.15	6.92	5.38	13.46
Row %	-	8.57	51.43	40.00	100.00
Column %	-	9.68	14.40	13.46	-

Cooperative/Association

Frequency	(1)	0	4	1	5
Percentage	-	0.00	1.54	0.38	1.92
Row %	-	0.00	80.00	20.00	100.00
Column %	-	0.00	3.20	0.96	-

International Private Sector

Frequency	0	0	1	1	2
Percentage	-	0.00	0.38	0.38	0.77
Row %	-	0.00	50.00	50.00	100.00
Column %	-	0.00	0.80	0.96	-

Local Private Sector

Frequency	0	0	0	1	1
Percentage	-	0.00	0.00	0.38	0.38
Row %	-	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00
Column %	-	0.00	0.00	0.96	-

Pastoral/Nomadic Groups

Frequency	(1)	0	0	0	0
Percentage	-	-	-	-	0.00
Row %	-	-	-	-	0.00
Column %	-	-	-	-	-

Village/Settlements					
Frequency	0	1	0	0	1
Percentage	-	0.38	0.00	0.00	0.38
Row %	-	100.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
Column %	-	3.23	0.00	0.00	-

Insufficient Data					
Frequency	(2)	0	0	11	11
Percentage	-	0.00	0.00	4.23	4.23
Row %	-	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00
Column %	-	0.00	0.00	10.58	-

Other					
Frequency	(1)	0	0	0	0
Percentage	-	-	-	-	0.00
Row %	-	-	-	-	0.00
Column %	-	-	-	-	-

Total					
Frequency	(16)	31	126	104	261
Percentage	-	11.87	48.27	39.84	100.00
Column %	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	-

Not included in total responses; total projects remain at 277.

"Somewhat successful" and "successful" categories have been combined into one column.

Table 29. Primary Kind of Management Intervention Compared to Success, by Frequency and Percentage

Degree of Success					
	None	Not Very Successful	Insufficient Successful	Total Kind Data	Responses
Nonea					
Frequency	(3)	(5)	(45)	(49)	-
Percentage	-	-	-	-	-
Row %	-	-	-	-	-
Column %	-	-	-	-	-
Structural/Organizational/Institutional					
Structural/Organizational/Institutional (General)					
Frequency	0	3	3	2	8

Percentage	-	1.85	1.85	1.23	4.94
Row %	-	37.50	37.50	25.00	100.00
Column %	-	11.54	3.70	3.64	-

Relation of Project to Higher Authorities

Frequency	0	0	0	2	2
Percentage	-	0.00	0.00	1.23	1.23
Row %	-	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00
Column %	-	0.00	0.00	3.64	-

Relation of Project to Beneficiaries

Frequency	0	0	5	1	6
Percentage	-	0.00	3.09	0.62	3.70
Row %	-	0.00	83.33	16.67	100.00
Column %	-	0.00	6.17	1.82	-

Relation of Project to Government Agencies

Frequency	0	0	0	1	1
Percentage	-	0.00	0.00	0.62	0.62
Row %	-	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00
Column %	-	0.00	0.00	1.82	-

Nature of Project Support Activities

Frequency	(6)	15	52	36	103
Percentage	-	9.26	32.10	22.22	63.58
Row %	-	14.56	50.49	34.95	100.00
Column %	-	57.69	64.20	65.45	-

Relation of Project to Traditional Structures

Frequency	0	1	2	0	3
Percentage	-	0.62	1.23	0.00	1.85
Row %	-	33.33	66.67	0.00	100.00
Column %	-	3.85	2.47	0.00	-

Relation of Project to Traditional Structures

Frequency	0	0	1	0	1
Percentage	-	0.00	0.62	0.00	0.62
Row %	-	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00
Column %	-	0.00	1.23	0.00	-

Improvements in Administrative Processes

Improvements in Administrative Processes (General)

Frequency	0	2	3	2	7
Percentage	-	1.23	1.85	1.23	4.32
Row %	-	28.57	42.86	28.57	100.00
Column %	-	7.69	3.70	3.64	-

Monitoring/Evaluation

Frequency	0	0	1	1	2
Percentage	-	0.00	0.62	0.62	1.23
Row %	-	0.00	50.00	50.00	100.00
Column %	-	0.00	1.23	1.82	-

Improved Financial and Commodity Management

Improved Financial and Commodity Management

Frequency	0	0	4	1	5
Percentage	-	0.00	2.47	0.62	3.09
Row %	-	0.00	80.00	20.00	100.00
Column %	-	0.00	4.94	1.82	-

Financial Management

Frequency	0	0	3	0	3
Percentage	-	0.00	1.85	0.00	1.85
Row %	-	0.00	100.00	00.00	100.00
Column %	-	0.00	3.70	00.00	-

Improved Human Resources Management

Human Resources Management (General)

Frequency	0	0	0	2	2
Percentage	-	0.00	0.00	1.23	1.23
Row %	-	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00
Column %	-	0.00	0.00	3.64	-

Beneficiaries

Frequency	0	0	1	0	1
Percentage	-	0.00	0.62	0.00	0.62
Row %	-	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00
Column %	-	0.00	1.23	0.00	-

Cadre

Frequency	0	0	1	1	2
Percentage	-	0.00	0.62	0.62	1.23
Row %	-	0.00	50.00	50.00	100.00
Column %	-	0.00	1.23	1.82	-

Managers and Leaders

Frequency	0	0	1	0	1
Percentage	-	0.00	0.62	0.00	0.62
Row %	-	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00
Column %	-	0.00	1.23	0.00	-

Other Human Resources

Frequency	0	1	0	0	1
Percentage	-	0.62	0.00	0.00	0.62
Row %	-	100.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
Column %	-	3.85	0.00	0.00	-

Contextual Factors Related to Management

Capabilities of Foreign Technicians

Frequency	0	1	0	0	1
Percentage	-	0.62	0.00	0.00	0.62
Row %	-	100.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
Column %	-	3.85	0.00	0.00	-

Sociocultural Factors

Frequency	0	0	0	0	1
Percentage	-	0.00	0.00	0.62	100.00
Row %	-	0.00	0.00	100.00	-
Column %	-	0.00	0.00	1.82	-

Political Factors

Frequency	0	1	0	0	1
Percentage	-	0.62	0.00	0.00	0.62
Row %	-	100.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
Column %	-	3.85	0.00	0.00	-

Insufficient Data

Frequency	(6)	1	2	3	6
Percentage	-	0.62	1.23	1.85	3.70
Row %	-	16.67	33.33	50.00	100.00
Column %	-	3.85	2.47	5.45	-

Other

Frequency	(1)	1	2	2	5
Percentage	-	0.62	1.23	1.23	100.00
Row %	-	20.00	40.00	40.00	-
Column %	-	3.85	2.47	3.64	-

Total

Frequency	-	26	81	55	162
Percentage	-	16.05	50.00	33.95	100.00

Not included in total responses; total projects remain at 277.

"Somewhat successful" and "successful" categories have been combined into

one column.

Table 30. Primary Type of Management Intervention Compared to Success, by Frequency and Percentage

Degree of Success						
Type	Not Very		Insufficient		Total	Responses
	Nonea	Successful	Successfulb		Data	
Nonea						
Frequency	(5)	(4)	(44)	(52)	-	
Percentage	-	-	-	-	-	
Row %	-	-	-	-	-	
Column %	-	-	-	-	-	
Technical Assistance						
Frequency	(6)	15	54	25	94	
Percentage	-	9.32	33.54	15.53	58.39	
Row %	-	15.96	57.45	26.60	100.00	
Column %	-	55.56	65.85	48.08	-	
Training						
Frequency	(4)	10	24	21	55	
Percentage	-	6.21	14.91	13.04	34.16	
Row %	-	18.18	43.64	38.18	100.00	
Column %	-	37.04	29.27	40.38	-	
Direct Management						
Frequency	0	1	1	1	3	
Percentage	-	0.62	0.62	0.62	1.86	
Row %	-	33.33	33.33	33.33	100.00	
Column %	-	3.70	1.22	1.92	-	
Financial Transfer						
Frequency	0	0	0	1	1	
Percentage	-	0.00	0.00	0.62	0.62	
Row %	-	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	
Column %	-	0.00	0.00	1.92	-	
Other						
Frequency	0	0	2	1	3	
Percentage	-	0.00	1.24	0.62	1.86	
Row %	-	0.00	66.67	33.33	100.00	
Column %	-	0.00	2.44	1.92	-	

Insufficient Data

Frequency	(1)	1	1	3	5
Percentage	-	0.62	0.62	1.86	3.11
Row %	-	20.00	20.00	60.00	100.00
Column %	-	3.70	1.22	5.77	-

Total	(16)				
Frequency	-	27	82	52	161
Percentage	-	16.77	50.93	32.30	100.00
Column %	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	-

Not included in total responses; total projects remain at 277.

"Somewhat successful" and "successful" categories have been combined into one column.

Table 31. Enhancement/Training Skill Area
Compared to Success, by Frequency and Percentage

Skill Area	Degree of Success				Total Data	Responses
	Nonea	Not Very Successful	Insufficient Successfulb			
Nonea						
Frequency	(4)	(4)	(46)	(53)	-	
Percentage	-	-	-	-	-	
Row %	-	-	-	-	-	
Column %	-	-	-	-	-	
Structural/Organizational Management						
Frequency	0	0	2	0	2	
Percentage	-	0.00	1.27	0.00	1.27	
Row %	-	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	
Column %	-	0.00	2.50	0.00	-	
Administrative Management						
Frequency	0	0	3	1	4	
Percentage	-	0.00	1.90	0.63	2.53	
Row %	-	0.00	75.00	25.00	100.00	
Column %	-	0.00	3.75	1.96	-	
Financial/Commodities Management						
Frequency	(1)	2	15	2	19	
Percentage	-	1.27	9.49	1.27	12.03	
Row %	-	10.53	78.95	10.53	100.00	
Column %	-	7.41	18.75	3.92	-	

Human Resources Management

Frequency	(2)	0	0	1	1
Percentage	-	0.00	0.00	0.63	0.63
Row %	-	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00
Column %	-	0.00	0.00	1.96	-

Contextual Factors Related to Management

Frequency	(5)	21	48	32	101
Percentage	-	13.29	30.38	20.25	63.92
Row %	-	20.79	47.52	31.68	100.00
Column %	-	77.78	60.00	62.75	-

General or Multiple Area Management

Frequency	(1)	1	10	4	15
Percentage	-	0.63	6.33	2.53	9.49
Row %	-	6.67	66.67	26.67	100.00
Column %	-	3.70	12.50	7.84	-

Insufficient Data

Frequency	(3)	2	2	9	13
Percentage	-	1.27	1.27	5.70	8.23
Row %	-	15.38	15.38	69.23	100.00
Column %	-	7.41	2.50	17.65	-

Other

Frequency	0	1	0	2	3
Percentage	-	0.63	0.00	1.27	1.90
Row %	-	33.33	0.00	66.67	100.00
Column %	-	3.70	0.		
00	3.92	-			

Total

Frequency	(16)	27	80	51	158
Percentage	-	17.09	50.63	32.28	100.00
Column %	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	-

Not included in total responses; total projects remain at 277.

"Somewhat successful" and "successful" categories have been combined into one column.

Table 32. Enhancement/Training Recipients
Compared to Success, by Frequency and Percentage

Degree of Success					
Recipients	Not Very Nonea	Successful	Insufficient Successfulb	Total Data	Responses

Nonea

Frequency	(5)	(5)	(46)	(53)	-
Percentage	-	-	-	-	-
Row %	-	-	-	-	-
Column %	-	-	-	-	-

Beneficiaries/General Public

Frequency	(2)	6	13	5	24
Percentage	-	3.82	8.28	3.18	15.29
Row %	-	25.00	54.17	20.83	100.00
Column %	-	23.08	16.25	9.80	-

Bureaucrats/Administrators/Cadre

Frequency	(6)	18	63	35	116
Percentage	-	11.46	40.13	22.29	73.89
Row %	-	15.52	54.31	30.17	100.00
Column %	-	69.23	78.75	68.63	-

Managers/Leaders

Frequency	0	0	3	3	6
Percentage	-	0.00	1.91	1.91	3.82
Row %	-	0.00	50.00	50.00	100.00
Column %	-	0.00	3.75	5.88	-

Insufficient Data

Frequency	(2)	1	1	6	8
Percentage	-	0.64	0.64	3.82	5.10
Row %	-	12.50	12.50	75.00	100.00
Column %	-	3.85	1.25	11.76	-

Other

Frequency	(1)	1	0	2	3
Percentage	-	0.64	0.00	1.27	1.91
Row %	-	33.33	0.00	66.67	100.00
Column %	-	3.85	0.00	3.92	-

Total

Frequency	(16)	27	80	51	157
Percentage	-	17.09	50.96	32.48	100.00
Column %	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	-

Not included in total responses; total projects remain at 277.

"Somewhat successful" and "successful" categories have been combined into one column.

APPENDIX A

LIST OF PROJECTS IN CASE SURVEY

Country Ended	Project No.	Project Title	FY Began		
Djibouti	6030001	Water Resources and Soils Analysis	79	83	
	6030003	Fisheries Development I	79	83	
Zambia	6110202	Trng for Women Dev-Overseas Ed Fund (PVO)	79	82	
Malawi	6120054	Bunda Agricultural College	76	82	
Zimbabwe	6130201	Rural Health Services	80	81	
	6130203	Zimbabwe Labor Development	80	82	
	6130204	Science and Technology Cooperation	80	83	
Kenya	6150000	Schistosomiasis Control II	60	77	
	6150055	Non-formal Education and Training	77	79	
	6150137	Scholarship Coordination	67	75	
	6150141	Population Dynamics	72	78	
	6150147	Vihiga Rural Development	71	78	
	6150148	Agriculture Credit	71	80	
	6150153	Kenya National Youth Service	70	75	
	6150157	National Range-Ranch Development	72	82	
	6150158	University of Nairobi Veterinary Faculty	71	80	
	6150159	Opportunities Industrial Center	73	76	
	6150160	Livestock Development	74	80	
	6150161	Family Planning	75	81	
	6150162	Rural Planning	76	81	
	6150164	Marginal Semi-Arid Lands Development	75	80	
	6150166	CARE Water Development	75	77	
	6150170	Roads Gravelling	77	83	
	6150171	Agriculture Sector Loan I	75	80	
	6150173	Rural Blindness Prevention (PVO)	76	80	
	6150174	Rural Enterprise Development	77	81	
	6150179	Kibwezi Primary Health Care (PVO)	79	82	
	6150184	Increase Employment Income Prod (OPG)	78	82	
	6150185	Kitui Primary Health Care (PVO)	79	83	
	6150202	Savings Union Support (OPG)	80	82	
	6150203	Rural Blindness Prevention II	80	83	
	6150208	Small Business Development (OPG)	82	83	
	6150209	Law in Development (PVO)	80	83	
	6150214	Technological Training	81	83	
Uganda	6170000	Technical Support	61	78	
	6170006	Agricultural Cooperatives	58	75	
	6170011	Secondary Girls Schools	62	75	
	6170012	Agricultural Extension	63	75	
	6170019	Institute of Public Administration	65	76	

	6170023	Agriculture Education	74	77	
	6170052	Livestock Production	71	75	
	6170057	Training in MCH and Family Planning	70	75	
	6170060	Graduate Agriculture Faculty	71	76	
	6170102	Food Production Support	81	83	
Nigeria	6200000	Technical Support	60	77	
	6200214	Pub Lib Ser Training & Staff Support	59	79	
	6200602	University of Nigeria	60	76	
	6200710	Northern Nigeria Teacher Education	64	75	
	6200719	Calabar-Ikom Road	63	76	
	6200720	Ibadan Water Supply	63	75	
	6200730	Fed Advanced Teachers College	64	76	
	6200735	PH Comprehensive Secondary School	64	77	
	6200740	Zaria Institution Admin Ahmadu Bello Univ	65	77	
	6200742	Faculty of Ag Univ of IFE	65	77	
	6200743	Ag and Vet Medicine Ahmadu Bello Univ	65	77	
	6200788	Institute of Educ Ahmadu Bello Univ	71	77	
	6200789	Family Health Training	73	78	
	6200792	Adv Professional Studies of Univ of IFE	71	78	
	6200798	Food Crop Production	71	79	
	6200802	Opportunity Industrialization	70	77	
	6200817	Veterinary Faculty Ahmadu Bello Univ	71	79	
Tanzania	6210000	Malaria Control (Zanzibar)	60	75	
	6210050	Technical Education	64	75	
	6210064	Economic and Engineering Survey	64	75	
	6210065	Educ Materials & Advisory Service	65	75	
	6210081	Tan Zam Highway	70	77	
	6210092	Seed Multiplication and Distribution	70	82	
	6210093	Masai Livestock & Range Management	70	81	
	6210098	Mgt Engineering Services	69	75	
	6210099	Agriculture Marketing Development	71	80	
	6210101	Agricultural Materials & Services	69	78	
	6210103	Agriculture Project Support	71	77	
	6210107	Agricultural Research	70	83	
	6210110	Highway Maintenance & Organization	70	75	
	6210117	Agricultural Credit	74	82	
	6210118	Tsetse Fly Eradication	71	77	
	6210121	Manpower Training Program for MCH Aides	73	82	
	6210122	Livestock Marketing and Development	73	82	
	6210129	Dairy Production Assistance (PVO)	75	78	
	6210133	Agriculture Sector Loan I	75	76	
	6210138	Hanang District Health (PVO)	77	82	
	6210139	Primary Schools (PVO)	76	80	
	6210142	Agricultural Projects Support	73	78	
	6210143	Arusha Regional Planning and Village Dev	78	83	
	6210147	Cancer Control Codel (PVO)	78	83	
	6210154	Continuing Educ for Health Workers (PVO)	78	83	
	6210156	Farming Systems Research	82	83	
	6210162	Arusha Women's Participation in Dev	79	83	
	6210167	Mbugwe Division Water Supply	81	82	
	6210168	Kisongo Water Catch Development	81	83	
	6210170	Masai Dist Village Water & Transp Dev	81	82	

Cameroon	6310001	North Cameroon Seed Multiplication	76	83
	6310002	Centers for Training Farm Families (PVO)	77	82
	6310003	Cameroon Low-Income Housing	76	80
	6310009	Practical Training in Health Education	77	82
	6310010	North Cameroon Pilot-Comm Dev Fndtn (PVO)	77	82
	6310011	Transcameroon Railroad III	78	81
	6310012	Mandara Mountains Water Resources	79	82
	6310017	National Planning for Community Dev	79	82
	6310018	Mile 47--Mamfe Road	66	75
	6310019	Transcameroon Railway	75	75
	6310034	Training for Small Business (PVO)	80	82
	6310040	Nutrition Advisory Services	79	82
	6310201	North Cameroon Rural Health Educ (PVO)	75	82
Lesotho	6320030	Southern Africa Dev Personnel & Trng	72	80
	6320031	Thaba Bosiu Rural Development	73	80
	6320048	Land and Water Resources Development	74	82
	6320064	Lesotho Agricultural Analysis	77	81
	6320066	Nutrition Planning and Research (PVO)	76	80
	6320089	Low Cost Bldg Materials Production	77	81
	6320209	Cottage Mohair Industry (PVO)	78	81
	6320210	Commodity Warehousing (PVO)	78	81
	6320211	Weaving Training (PVO)	79	81
	6320217	Opportunities Indust Center (PVO)	80	83
Botswana	6330006	Botswana-Zambia Road	72	79
	6330015	Range Management and Livestock Dev	73	82
	6330030	Southern Africa Dev Personnel and Trng	72	80
	6330032	Maternal Child Health/Family Planning	72	80
	6330056	Botswana Crop Production	76	82
	6330059	Botswana Rural Manpower Development	75	78
	6330069	Southern Africa Manpower Development	78	83
	6330073	Transport Sector	79	83
	6330084	Environmental Sanitation	79	82
	6330092	Self-Help Housing Development (PVO)	77	83
	6330095	National Migration Study	77	82
	6330102	UNHCR Trust Fund for Student Refugees	77	81
	6330212	Rural Enterprise Extension Serv (PVO)	78	82
	6330215	Horticultural Development (PVO)	78	83
	6330231	Botswana Workforce and Skills Training	82	82
Gambia	6350211	Albert Market (PVO)	80	81
	6350215	Training for Development	80	82
	6350217	Integrated Rural Development (PVO)	81	83
	6360017	Adaptive Crop Research and Extension	68	80
Sierra Leone	6360101	CARE Rural Penetration Rds (PVO)	77	79
	6360108	Increasing Revenue for Development I	78	83
	6360111	Rural Roads II -- CARE (PVO)	78	80
	6360112	Cooperative Credit Society-CUNA (PVO)	79	83
	6360126	CARE Rural Penetration Roads	75	77
	6360168	OICI Vocational Training I	79	82
Ghana	6410000	Program Development Services	57	78

	6410031	Volta River Authority	62	77	
	6410041	Faculty of Agriculture Univ of Ghana	66	76	
	6410048	National Agricultural Planning	68	77	
	6410055	Danfa Rural Health Planning	69	81	
	6410062	Economic Development Management	71	79	
	6410063	Opportunities Industrialization	70	79	
	6410064	Population Program Support	71	82	
	6410066	Public Safety	71	76	
	6410067	Managed Input Delivery/Ag Services I	76	82	
	6410068	Management Rural Health Services	74	81	
	6410069	Development Applications of Science	75	80	
	6410070	Agricultural Management Development	75	82	
	6410072	Farmers Assoc/Agri-Business (PVO)	77	82	
	6410073	District Planning & Rural Development	77	82	
	6410074	Ag Rehabilitation & Health Production	76	79	
	6410075	Women in Development	75	77	
	6410077	Economic & Rural Development Management	77	83	
	6410083	Women in Ghanaian Development (WID)	76	81	
	6410087	Programs in Population Dynamics	77	82	
	6410095	Community Dev Staff Training (PVO)	78	81	
	6410101	Oppor Indust Cnt Intl-Ghana (PVO)	77	79	
	6410996	Selected Dev Pro Tech Support	74	76	
	6410999	Food and Nutrition Tech Support	74	76	
Swaziland	6450005	Swaziland Curriculum Development	72	78	
	6450024	Small Farmer Agriculture Credit	71	79	
	6450030	Southern Africa Dev Personnel and Trng	72	80	
	6450055	Cooperatives and Marketing	76	82	
Somalia	6490035	Chismaio Port	61	75	
	6490036	National Teachers Education Center	63	75	
	6490038	Agricultural Services	62	75	
	6490103	Kurtunwarre Settlement Program	79	82	
	6490117	Grain Transport Grant	80	81	
	6490122	CDA Forestry Phase I--Refugee Areas	83	83	
	6490123	Refugee Self-Reliance	83	83	
Sudan	6500010	Extension Education/Training (OPG)	77	80	
	6500019	Southern Primary Health Care	78	83	
	6500025	Abye Integrated Rural Development (PVO)	78	81	
	6500026	Wadi Halfa Community Development	78	82	
	6500035	Yambio Agricultural Research (OPG)	79	83	
	6500039	Petroleum Training	80	81	
	6500045	Rural Gum Arabic Reforestation	80	81	
	6500046	Southern Ag Development Phase I	82	83	
	6500050	Port Sudan Refugee Water Supply	81	83	
	6500063	Model Family Planning Program (PVO)	82	83	
	6500100	Sudan-Rahad Project	73	79	
	6500103	Agriculture and Natural Resources (PVO)	76	78	
Cape Verde	6550001	Rural Works-Disaster Relief	75	82	
	6550002	Rural Works (Soil Water)	78	80	
	6550003	Tarrafal Water Resources	77	83	
	6550004	Mindelo Desalination	77	83	
	6550009	Watershed Management-Soil Conservation	79	83	

Guinea Bissau	6570003	Primary Teacher Training	77	82
	6570006	Small-Scale Fisheries	79	83
Zaire	6600000	Technical Support	60	75
	6600014	Water Transport Improvements	63	77
	6600025	Agricultural Marketing Support Loan	68	75
	6600032	Transport Sector	70	82
	6600048	Road Transport	71	77
	6600049	Maternal & Child Health/Family Planning	72	80
	6600050	Planning and Management Services	72	78
	6600053	Transportation	73	77
	6600054	Inland Waterways	75	80
	6600055	Nutrition Planning	75	81
	6600056	Fisheries Cooperative Expansion	77	77
	6600057	Health Systems Development	76	82
	6600058	Endemic & Communicable Disease Control	76	83
	6600060	Feasibility Studies	75	77
	6600062	Feasibility Study	75	77
	6600067	Basic Family Health Services	80	82
	6600071	Erts/Zaire	77	81
	6600075	Cedeco (PVO-OPG)	77	81
	6600081	Karawa (PVO-OPG)	78	81
	6600082	Imeloko (PVO-OPG)	78	81
Seychelles	6620002	Food Crop Research	79	82
	6620003	Agriculture Sector Development	82	82
Ethiopia	6630000	Technical Support	52	78
	6630006	Malaria Control	58	80
	6630110	Civil Aviation Improvement	69	75
	630111	Agricultural Advisory Services	64	76
	630112	Borona Picot Range Development	65	75
	6630116	Economic and Financial Planning	65	77
	6630136	University College of Education	60	75
	6630138	University General Support	60	80
	6630143	Haile Selassie University Expansion	70	75
	6630147	Customs Administration	68	77
	6630153	Feasibility Studies	71	78
	6630157	Development Agriculture Sector	70	75
	6630158	Government Budgetary Practices	69	75
	6630159	Shashemanne Agricultural Development	70	76
	6630160	Highway Equipment Repair Facility	70	75
	6630161	Export Promotion and Investment	69	75
	6630162	Ada District Development	77	79
	6630166	Pulses Diversification and Improvement	74	80
	6630167	Rural Agricultural Development	72	79
	6630172	Agriculture Sector Planning	73	78
	6630175	Opportunities Industrialization	73	78
	6630177	Fifth Intercity Highways Project	73	79
	6630178	Agricultural Sector Loan IV	75	76
	6630179	Upper Didesa Development	78	79
	6630180	Integrated Family Life Education (PVO)	76	77
	6630183	Manpower Assistance	75	77
	6630184	Drought Field Communications	75	77
	6630185	Christian Relief Committee	75	77

	6630186	R & R Commission of Ethiopia	75	76
	6630187	Drought Recovery and Rehabilitation	76	80
	6630210	Southern Gemu Gofa Rehab Phase I	77	78
	6630211	International Disaster Seminar	77	77
	6630213	Integrated Family Life--World EDCTN (PVO)	78	82
	6630214	Micro Regional, Rural Dev -- Ort (PVO)	78	79
	6630215	Inland Transportation	77	78
	6630220	Seed/Oxen/Tool Replacement Fund	78	78
	6630228	Spa-Planning Assistance	78	79
	6630229	Seventh Day Adventist (Proj)	78	78
Liberia	6690000	Technical Support	60	75
	6690027	Public Safety	60	75
	6690054	National Medical Center	60	78
	6690081	Construct Access Road	69	75
	6690107	Airport Improvement	69	77
	6690110	Maternal & Child Health Training	68	76
	6690111	Telecommunications Expansion	71	78
	6690116	Rural Access Roads II	72	79
	6690117	Highway Maintenance Equipment	73	76
	6690122	Institute of Public Administration	72	78
	6690123	Agriculture Program Development	72	79
	6690124	Civil Service Development	74	79
	6690125	Lofa County Rural Health	75	79
	6690127	Agricultural Cooperative Development	77	82
	6690131	Vocational Training	78	82
	6690138	Rural Roads Phase III	77	82
	6690141	Agricultural Training -- YMCA of US (PVO)	77	79
	6690142	Upper Lofa County Rural Development	75	81
	6690143	Road Maintenance Equipment	75	79
	6690145	Agricultural Credit Bank	79	82
	6690146	Low-Income Housing Phase I	78	83
	6690154	Nimba County Entrepreneurial Dev (PVO)	78	82
	6690157	Hand Dug Wells	78	81
	6690159	Navigational Aids at Principal Airports	79	89
	6690160	Youth On-the-Job Training	79	83
	6690165	Primary Health Care	83	83
	6690169	Medical Equipment and Supplies	80	82
	6690175	Program Grant I	80	80
	6690177	Program Grant III	81	81
	6690179	Program Grant V	83	83
C.A.R.	6760001	Seed Production Center	76	80
	6760002	Ouham Province Rural Health	76	80
	6760004	Fish Culture Extension	77	80
	6760202	Central African Rep-Rural Village Wells	75	80
Chad	6770001	Lake Chad Irrigated Agriculture	77	81
	6770002	Agriculture Institutional Development	78	83
	6770004	Rural Health Planning and Management	78	81
	6770005	Comprehensive Human Resources Dev	78	81
	6770008	CARE Acacia Albida Expansion (PVO)	78	79
	6770009	Irrigated Crop Production	76	80
	6770014	Crop/Prod/Res/Seed/Multi/Grain Market	78	83
	6770020	CARE Rural Family Grain Storage (PVO)	77	79

	6770021	CARE Rural School Construction (PVO)	78	79
	6770022	Rural Sanitary Water	78	83
	6770023	CARE Food Delivery and Rural Works (PVO)	78	80
	6770032	Chad Road Maintenance	78	83
	6770033	Emergency Livestock Vaccination Campaign	78	79
	6770201	Chad Range and Livestock Development	78	80
Congo Basin	6790005	Nutrition Education Dev & Training (PVO)	80	83
	6800207	Soya Protn/Nutrtn-Catholic Rlf Serv (PVO)	79	83
Mauritania	6820201	Integrated Rural Development (Guidimaka)	75	82
	6820202	Rural Medical Assistance	79	83
	6820204	Vegetable Production	78	83
	6820205	Renewable Resources Management	78	83
	6820211	Rural Assessment/Manpower Services (Rams)	78	81
	6820214	Rural Roads Improvement	82	83
	6820226	Small Irrigated Perimeters (PVO)	81	82
Niger	6830025	Niger River Bridge	64	75
	6830180	Road Maintenance	65	79
	6830201	Niger Cereals Production	74	82
	6830202	Niger Range and Livestock Management	76	82
	6830204	Entente Livestock II	76	80
	6830205	Niamey Department Rural Development	77	81
	6830214	Basic Health Services Delivery (PVO)	76	81
	6830224	Niger Shelter Sector Planning	78	83
	6830228	Rural Integrated Agricultural Dev (PVO)	78	81
	6830235	Niger Solar Energy	78	81
	6830706	Fada Ngourma Road Design Study	73	76
	6830708	Entente Spare Parts Grant	71	76
	6830915	Niger River Basin Development	76	79
Senegal	6850201	Cereals Production I	75	79
	6850209	Grain Storage	77	83
	6850239	Caritas Village Development (AIP)	79	82
	6850240	Lowland Fisheries (AIP)	79	82
	6850241	Support to Enea (AIP)	79	81
	6850243	Africare Forestry (PVO)	80	83
	6850247	Africare/PC Village Woodlots (PVO)	80	83
	6850937	Renewable AID Energy	79	83
Upper Volta	6860201	Eastern Ord Integrated Rural Development	74	81
	6860202	Seed Multiplication	74	81
	6860203	Village Livestock Development	76	81
	6860211	Strengthening Women's Roles in Dev	77	82
	6860212	Oncho Freed Area Village Development	78	82
	6860215	Eastern Ord Rural Roads	77	82
	6860219	Rural Enterprise Development (PVO)	77	81
	6860220	Dori Integrated Rural Development (PVO)	76	80
Madagascar	6870031	Railroad Improvement Project	66	77
	6870035	Telecommunications--Phase II	73	77
Mali	6880001	Teachers Training College	61	77

	6880002	Central Veterinary Laboratory	68	77	
	6880201	Mali Livestock Development	74	80	
	6880202	Operation Mils--Phase II	76	83	
	6880203	Livestock Sector I	75	83	
	6880204	Rural Works	77	82	
	6680206	Action Riz-Sorgho	76	83	
	6680209	Community Dev Program for Women (PVO)	77	79	
	6680212	Kayes-Nioro Road	80	83	
	6680213	Action Ble	78	83	
	6680219	Semi-Arid Tropics Research	79	81	
	6680220	San Pilot Fish Production (PVO)	79	82	
	6680222	Higher Education Training College	79	82	
	6680224	Rural Water Improvement (PVO)	80	82	
Togo	6930213	Low-Income Shelter	78	83	
	6930220	Togo Credit Unions--CUNA (PVO)	80	83	
	6930222	Togo Ag Training/Extension Support (PVO)	82	83	
Burundi	6950108	Rural Road (Route 84)	80	83	
Rwanda	6960100	Food Storage and Marketing	75	82	
	6960101	Reduction of Food Wastage	75	76	
	6960103	Farm Hand Tools (PVO)	78	82	
	6960108	Cooperative Grain Storage (PVO)	78	81	

APPENDIX B

CASE SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

1. BACKGROUND PROJECT DATA

	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)
³ Country	³ Start	³ End	³ Function	³ LOP	³ Cost	³ Purpose	³ Tech	³ Coder
3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3

2. PROJECT TARGET

Primary ³ ³
Secondary ³ ³

3. PRINCIPAL ORGANIZATIONAL DIRECTION

Primary ³ ³ Comments:
Secondary ³ ³

4. DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT ENHANCEMENT INTERVENTION

	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
³ Kind	³ Type	³ Success	³ Doc	³
Primary	3	3	3	3
Other	3	3	3	3
Other	3	3	3	3
Other	3	3	3	3

Other/Comments:

5. ENHANCEMENT/TRAINING COMPONENT

	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)
	³ Method	³ Skill Area	³ Location	³ Duration	³ Recipients
Primary	³	³	³	³	³
Other	³	³	³	³	³
Other	³	³	³	³	³
Other	³	³	³	³	³

6. PROJECT ASSESSMENT

(a)	(b)
³ Document	³ Success
³	³ Comments:
³	³
³	³
³	³
³	³
³	³

7. DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PROBLEMS

	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)
	³ Structural	³ Administ	³ Financial	³ Hum Res	³ Context
	³	³ ³	³ ³	³ ³	³
Primary	³	³ ³	³ ³	³ ³	³
Other	³	³ ³	³ ³	³ ³	³
Other	³	³ ³	³ ³	³ ³	³

8. LESSONS LEARNED/COMMENTS

APPENDIX C

CODING INSTRUCTIONS FOR DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT CASE SURVEY

1. BACKGROUND PROJECT DATA

- Country. Seven-digit country/project code.
- Start. Final two digits of the year the project was initiated.
- End. Final two digits of the year the project was terminated.
- Code. Four-digit PPC functional subcategory code.
- LOP Cost. Life of project cost in thousands of dollars.
- g. Purpose Code, Technical Code, Coder Identification

2. PROJECT TARGET

The people or groups directly targeted to receive project benefits or services; the people or groups directly affected by or participating in the project. Select no more than one primary target group and one secondary target group (if applicable) from the following categories:

- 10. Population at Large (or not otherwise identified)
 - 11. Agriculturalists, Herders, and Rural Populations
 - 12. Businessmen and Other Professionals
 - 13. Students
 - 14. Women
- 20. Organization/Association Cadre (undefined or multiple)
 - 21. Government -- administrators
 - 22. Nongovernment -- administrators
 - 23. Government -- technical and others
 - 24. Nongovernment -- technical and others
 - 25. Faculty
- 30. Senior Managers, Executives, and Leaders (undefined or multiple)
 - 31. Public sector managers and leaders
 - 32. Private sector managers and leaders

3. PRINCIPAL ORGANIZATIONAL DIRECTION

The primary level at which the project is managed and at which responsibility for everyday planning and implementation is lodged, as evidenced in the project abstract or logframe. Select only one from the following categories:

- 10. Formal Government (undefined or multiple level)
 - 11. National Government. A centralized agency, bureau, or office of the host country government
 - 12. Decentralized National Government. A regional or local branch, office, or unit of a national government agency
 - 13. State/Provincial Government. An agency, bureau, or office of a host country state or provincial government
 - 14. Subprovince/Municipal Government. An agency, bureau, or office of a host country local or municipal government
- 20. Semi-Government (undefined or multiple)
 - 21. Parastatal Organization. A quasi-independent private corporation/organization set up under the auspices (and general direction) of the host country government (includes marketing boards and government corporations)
 - 22. Separate Authority. A special public body governmental organization established by the host

country and a donor to administer a project

23. University/School/Institute

24. Bank

30. Semi-Private (undefined or multiple)

31. Indigenous PVO. A private voluntary organization that is indigenous to the host country

32. External PVO. A private voluntary organization that is external or international in scope (e.g., CARE)

33. Cooperative/Association. A voluntary organization established to support the needs or interests of individuals or groups with particular common interests or in a particular field (e.g., credit cooperatives, farm worker organizations)

40. Private Sector (undefined or multiple)

41. International Private Sector. A private firm that operates in the host country, but that is head-quartered externally and that is international in scope

42. National Private Sector. A private firm that is indigenous to the host country, but that is national or international in scope

43. Local Private Sector. A private firm that is indigenous to the host country and is local in scope

50. Traditional Groups (undefined or multiple)

51. Pastoral/Nomadic Groups. A traditional group that is not geographically fixed (e.g., a herding camp)

52. Village/Settlements. A traditional grouping that is geographically based, a community

53. Household/Family. Minimal production/consumption units

98. Insufficient Data

99. Other. (other primary levels of direction, not listed above; please delineate in comments)

4. DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT ENHANCEMENT INTERVENTION

A project output intended to improve the implementation, administration, or management of development projects, coded by kind of management improvement, type of intervention provided, degree of success, and source of information on success

a. Kind (of management improvement). The functional area of management that the intervention seeks to improve

01. None. The project did not have a specifically identified management development intervention (IF

NONE, GO TO QUESTION 6)

10. Structural/Organizational/Institutional Improvements.
Improvements in the design or organization of a management system
 11. Relation of Project to Higher Authorities
 12. Relation of Project to Beneficiaries
 13. Relation of Project to Government Agencies
 14. Nature of Project Support Services
 15. Relation of Project to Traditional Structures
 16. Relation of Project to Donors
 17. Continuing Host Government Support After Project Termination
 19. Other Organizational or Structural
20. Improvements in Administrative Processes. Improvements in general development management; in policy decision-making, to data analysis, and decision-making
 21. Authority and Decision-Making
 22. Coordination
 23. Planning. Assistance in formulating development policies and delineating project plans
 24. Monitoring and Evaluation. Improvements in developing and implementing plans for gathering data on project inputs, outputs, efficiency, and effectiveness in a timely and appropriate manner and in analyzing such information as a basis for program improvement and policy change
 25. Reporting. Improvements in gathering information on development project activities and summarizing it for reports to sponsors, superiors, and the general public
 26. Communication and Dissemination
30. Improved Financial and Commodity Management.
Improvements in managing revenues, allocating resources and costs, maintaining appropriate records, and developing and implementing budgets and finance plans
 31. Financial Management
 32. Commodity Management
 33. Other Resource Inputs
40. Improved Human Resources Management. Assistance in managing people and developing their capabilities, developing and implementing staffing plans, and employee relations
 41. Beneficiaries
 42. Cadre
 43. Managers and Leaders
 44. Other
50. Changes in Contextual Factors Related to Management
 51. Capabilities of Foreign Technicians
 52. Donor Procedures
 53. Sociocultural Factors

- 54. Political Factors
 - 55. Economic Factors
 - 56. Project Design and Complexity
 - 57. Policy Differences
 - 58. Geography/Climate
 - 59. Technology
98. Insufficient Data
99. Other. Assistance in functional areas of management not previously defined (explain specific area in comments)
- b. Type. The type of management intervention provided
10. Technical Assistance. Various kinds of formal and informal assistance, monitoring, collaboration, and consulting associated with the carrying out of regular management functions
20. Training. Formal and informal instruction oriented towards skill development that extends beyond the task at hand
30. Direct Management
40. Financial Transfer
50. Policy Dialogue
90. Other. (Please identify in comments)
98. Insufficient Data
- c. Success. The degree to which the management enhancement intervention fulfilled its goals and/or succeeded in improving development management, as evidenced from project evaluation, audit, and related reports
10. Not Very Successful. The enhancement intervention had few, if any, positive impacts on development management and/or achieved few of its management improvement goals; project was inefficient and ineffective in delivering the management enhancement intervention
20. Somewhat Successful. The enhancement intervention had some positive impact on development management and/or achieved some of its management improvement goals; while there may have been delays, the project effectively delivered the management enhancement intervention
30. Successful. The enhancement intervention had substantial positive impacts on development

management and/or achieved most of its management improvement goals

98. Insufficient Data

d. Document. The type of document/evaluation from which the information was obtained, coded as:

10. PAR or PES

20. Special Evaluation Report

30. Interim or Progress Report

40. Final Report

50. Audit Report

60. GAO Report

90. Other (Please identify)

5. ENHANCEMENT/TRAINING COMPONENT

Project component(s) designed to improve the management capabilities of host country personnel (including basic educational and skills training), coded in terms of type, location, duration, and recipients for the project's primary training component and for other substantial training activities

a. Method

01. No Training Component

11. Formal Schooling

12. Special Institute

13. Workshops/Seminars/Conferences

14. On-the-Job/Apprenticeship

15. Process Learning

16. Mass Media

18. Insufficient Data

19. Other (Please explain in comments)

b. Skill Area

10. Structural/Organizational Management

20. Administrative Management

30. Financial and Commodities Management

40. Human Resources Management

50. Contextual Factors Related to Management (e.g.,

technical skills)

60. General Management or Multiple Management Areas

88. Insufficient Data

99. Other (Please describe)

c. Location

21. In-Country

22. USA

23. Third Country

28. Insufficient Data

29. Other (Please explain in comments)

d. Duration (Select one)

31. Short Term (less than 6 months)

32. Long Term -- nondegree

33. Long Term -- degree

38. Insufficient Data

39. Other (Please explain in comments)

e. Recipients (Select one)

41. Beneficiaries/General Public

42. Bureaucrats/Administrators/Cadre

43. Managers/Leaders

48. Insufficient Data

49. Other (Please explain in comments)

NOTE: Responses for Questions 6 and 7 are based on information from Project Appraisal Reports (PARs), Project Evaluation Summaries (PES), Audit, or other evaluation documents in the DIS files

6. PROJECT ASSESSMENT

a. Type of Document. The type of document/evaluation from which the information was obtained, coded as:

10. PAR or PES

20. Special Evaluation Report

30. Interim or Progress Report

40. Final Report

50. Audit Report

60. GAO Report

90. Other (Please identify)

b. Project Assessment. Project success as evidenced from project evaluation, audit, and related documents.
Select from the following categories:

- 10. Not Very Successful. Project had few, if any, positive impacts on beneficiaries and achieved its purposes and goals, at best, in a very limited way; project was inefficient and ineffective in delivering inputs and producing outputs
- 20. Somewhat Successful. Project had some positive impacts on beneficiaries and achieved some of its purposes and goals; while there may have been some delays, the project effectively delivered most inputs and produced intended outputs
- 30. Successful. Project had substantial positive impacts on beneficiaries and achieved many of its purposes and goals; the project efficiently and effectively delivered most inputs and produced intended outputs

98. Insufficient Data

7. DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PROBLEMS

The primary and other substantial development management problems the project experienced, coded in terms of structural/organizational, administrative process, financial and commodities, human resources, and contextual factors, as evidenced from audit and evaluation reports in the DIS system

NOTE: Categories are not intended to be inclusive or closed-ended, and problems should not be "forced" into inappropriate categories. Make liberal use of the "other" category and provide more detailed explanations under comments.

001. None. No management problems were indicated in project documents

100. Structural/Organizational/Institutional (undefined or multiple)

- 111. Relation of Project to Higher Authorities
- 112. Relation of Project to Beneficiaries
- 113. Relation of Project to Other Government Agencies
- 114. Nature of Project Support Services
- 115. Relation of Project to Traditional Structures
- 116. Relation of Project to Donors
- 117. Continuing Host Government Support After

- Project Termination
- 119. Other Organizational or Structural
- 200. Administrative Processes (undefined or multiple)
 - 210. Authority and Decision-Making (undefined or multiple)
 - 211. Insufficient Authority/Actions To Understand or Improve
 - 212. Insufficient Decision-Making Ability Processes
 - 213. Insufficient Delegation of Authority
- 220. Coordination (undefined)
 - 221. Insufficient Coordination Among Project Staff
 - 222. Insufficient Coordination Among Government Agencies
 - 223. Insufficient Coordination Between Government and Donors
- 230. Inadequate or Incomplete Program Planning
- 240. Inadequate or Incomplete Program Monitoring and Evaluation
- 250. Inadequate or Incomplete Data Collection and Reporting
- 260. Inadequate or Incomplete Communication or Dissemination of Information
- 290. Other
- 300. Financial and Commodities Management (undefined or multiple)
 - 310. Financial Problems (undefined or multiple)
 - 311. Long-Term Financial Planning
 - 312. Inadequate Operational Budgeting
 - 313. Insufficient Local Currency
 - 314. Insufficient Foreign Exchange
 - 315. Timing/Availability
 - 316. Accounting
 - 317. Honesty/Theft/Corruption
 - 318. Information/Reporting
- 320. Commodities Problems (undefined or multiple)
 - 321. Long-Term Planning
 - 322. Timing and Availability
 - 323. Inventory and Warehousing
 - 324. Purchasing Procedures, Authority, and Approval
 - 325. End Use (in relation to planned use)
 - 326. Maintenance
- 330. Construction Problems

- 390. Other Resource Management Problems
- 400. Human Resources (undefined or multiple)
- 410. Beneficiaries (undefined or multiple)
- 411. Participation in Planning and Implementation
- 412. Attitude Toward Project
- 413. Skills/Performance Enhancement
- 420. Cadre (undefined or multiple)
- 421. Understanding of Project Purpose
- 422. Availability and Turnover
- 423. Competence and Experience
- 424. Motivation and Attitude Toward Project Goals
- 425. Conditions of Employment
- 426. Incentives and Prestige of Position
- 427. Skills/Performance Enhancement
- 430. Managers and Leaders (undefined or multiple)
- 431. Understanding of Project Purposes
- 432. Availability and Turnover
- 433. Competence and Experience
- 434. Motivation and Attitude Toward Project Goals
- 435. Conditions of Employment
- 436. Incentives and Prestige of Position
- 437. Performance
- 438. Skill/Performance Enhancement
- 440. Other Human Resources Problems (undefined or multiple)
- 441. Organization and Use of Internal Staff Services
- 442. Interpersonal Relationships
- 450. Quality of Enhancement Activity (undefined or multiple)
- 451. Relevance or Appropriateness
- 452. Timeliness
- 453. Quality of Training Staff
- 454. Quality of Pedagogy/Training Method
- 455. Selection of Trainees
- 456. Appropriateness of Language of Instruction
- 459. Other Quality Factors
- 490. Other Human Resources Management Factors
- 500. Contextual Factors Related to Management (undefined or multiple). Problems that are beyond the direct control of project managers
- 510. Capabilities of Foreign Technicians

- 520. Donor Procedures (undefined or multiple)
- 521. Planning
- 522. Implementation
- 523. Finance
- 524. Relation of Donor Managers to Host Country Counterparts
- 530. Sociocultural Factors
- 540. Political Factors
- 550. Economic Factors
- 560. Project Design and Complexity
- 570. Policy Differences During Implementation
- 580. Geography/Climate
- 590. Technology
- 980. Insufficient Data
- 990. Other (Please explain in comments)

8. LESSONS LEARNED/COMMENTS

General comments about management development enhancement activities.

APPENDIX D

COMPUTER ANALYSIS METHOD

Project cases were entered into a Wang office systems computer from the coding sheets (see Appendix B). The resulting data files were transmitted to an IBM mainframe computer for detailed analysis. The primary computer tool used in the analysis was the Statistical Analysis System (SAS), which contains many statistical routines, a programming language, and a file management facility. SAS was used to store the case survey data, to detect and correct errors and omissions, to combine the new cases, to examine the frequencies of each data field individually, and to examine combined frequencies among fields. In addition, SAS output formatting capabilities were used to present frequency relationships between fields as clearly as possible.

The case data were printed out in various formats to reveal missing or miscoded data. The cases were sorted by country-project code to locate duplicates. Frequencies were printed for each field to highlight unusual data values and to

provide a count of missing (not entered) values. Frequency tables showed how the values (e.g., codes, years, thousands of dollars) for a particular variable were distributed throughout the cases. For instance, a frequency table for starting year may have shown a count of 2 for 1975, 8 for 1976, and so forth. Thus, for example, a count of 1 for 1985 would have indicated an error. After frequency tables were compiled, the suspicious cases were located and errors were corrected. Missing data items, especially for the function and purpose codes, were reduced through additional coding of cases and through a search of the AID Development Information System. The supplemental values were keyed and programmed directly into the IBM mainframe computer SAS files.

When the data had become relatively clean and complete, fresh frequency tables were produced for each field to review the counts for the data values. The frequencies for each value or code varied from high to very sparse, depending (1) on the number of missing items and the total number of possible values for a variable and (2) on the relative distribution of cases among the possible values. These distributions for individual fields provided indications of potentially useful comparisons between fields. Groups of variables were collapsed for purpose codes into major categories (e.g., food supply, nutrition) (see Table 21) so that relationships between sectors could be compared with success and life of project cost. Cross-tabulation tables were produced to reveal relatively high or low counts of cases falling into paired values for two fields, such as a code for level of success and a code for the type of organizational direction. The paired frequencies pointed more or less strongly to a potential relationship, or lack thereof, between the variables.

The cross-tabulation tables display all the values of one variable down the left side of a page and all the values of the other variable across the top, thus creating a cell for every combination of values. Each cell displays the combined case count for the two variables. For instance, a cell may contain a count of five cases that ended in a specific year and were rated successful. Percentages for row and column total cell counts are also displayed in each cell. Relatively high or low cell counts and percentages, and patterns among cells, can be observed easily.

Although statistical tests such as chi square computation were not undertaken because preliminary tests showed little yield of possible significance, it should be noted that the irregular distribution of the frequencies in most of the cross-tabulations among certain variables would tend to indicate that had chi squares been run for certain categories within the sample, a high degree of statistical significance could be found. Given the range of possible values for certain categories, only a very aggregated retabulation would yield enough frequencies to make such tests fruitful and useful in explaining results. Early attempts to collapse categories before this data set yielded high levels of significance for

trivial or well-known associations (e.g., AID funds more technical assistance than training). A restructuring of the coding categories for future analysis could correct this by narrowing the range of responses.

Because there are many possible codes, years, amounts, and other values associated with the various fields, the cross-tabulation tables displaying all the values for the fields can be many pages long, with counts scattered sparsely among many cells. After the cross-tabulations containing all values had been closely examined, some of the values were collapsed (accumulated into more general categories) to provide more readable tables and larger, more meaningful counts per cell. Based on a study of the individual field frequencies, a total of 46 cross-tabulations displaying all values was produced. These, in turn, served as the basis for choosing a final set with collapsed values. This final set was chosen to display the most meaningful and potentially useful combined frequency distributions yielded by this set of management cases.

APPENDIX E

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT CASE SURVEY COMPUTER FILES

1. INTRODUCTION

Development management case survey data files and program files are stored on an easily accessible IBM mainframe computer. The files can be used to produce statistics and reports from the cases currently represented in the files. The case data can be changed or augmented, and additional cases can be added. Data can be keyed directly into IBM mainframe files or can be keyed using a Wang computer word processing program for easy formatting, and subsequently transmitted to the IBM for data analysis and statistical processing.

Experience with Time Sharing Option (TSO) and Statistical Analysis System (SAS) is required for use of the files. For information not present in this document concerning the location and use of software and hardware, see the appropriate AID Center for Development Information and Evaluation staff members.

2. TRANSMITTING DATA FROM MICRO TO MAINFRAME

Case data can be keyed using a Wang word processing program to take advantage of its formatting capabilities in organizing the many input data items. A word processing program is available on both the Wang office system computer and the Wang personal computer. The word processing program organizes the

input data into pages. It is important to avoid blank lines in the data and to avoid using an end-of-page marker in place of a carriage return. A carriage return should end the last line of a page, followed by the end-of-page marker. A carriage return by itself (a blank line) or a line without a carriage return will prevent the proper transmission of the data to the IBM.

Once the data have been keyed into a word processing file, it must be converted to a text file. In this step, all word processing formatting is removed, other than carriage returns. The best conversion program is on the Wang personal computer with hard disk in the Lynn St. building 4th floor personal computer center. If the data are located on the office system computer hard disk or 8-inch archive disk, copy the data to a 5 1/4-inch disk for use with the personal computer.

To convert the data to text format, insert the disk with the word processing file in drive A of the Wang personal computer. From the applications menu, choose the convert document to text option. Enter "a" (do not enter the quotes) as the input drive, and the name of your file as the input file. Enter "c" output drive, and "/wp" as the path (the word processing directory will be used). Enter your choice of name as the output file ID, and enter ".txt" as the extension. Press the execute key to activate the conversion. The text file will now be on the hard disk (drive C), and recorded in the word processing directory. Next, the text file must be written to a floppy disk. Remove the input disk from drive A and insert a blank formatted disk. Press the cancel key twice, or until the DOS (disk operating system) takes over the screen. The DOS prompt will appear as "C:", indicating that drive C (the hard disk) is the default drive. Enter "cd/wp" to identify the word processing directory as the one to use with drive C. After the next prompt enter "copy yourfile.txt a:" -- where "yourfile" is your chosen file name, and "a:" is drive A for the output file. (Use the execute key to execute each command entered.) At this point, a copy of the text file will be on the disk in drive A.

To transmit the text file to the IBM mainframe computer, use the IBM personal computer in the 5th floor computer terminal room (526). (The IBM personal computer can read the Wang personal computer disk.) Insert a disk with a copy of ASCOM (a communications program) in drive A of the IBM personal computer, and the text file disk in drive B. Key "ASCOM" to start the program. Key "XST" (extended status) to see all the current parameter settings. Key any of the following as commands if the displayed settings are different: BAUD 1200, PARITY EVEN, PROTOCOL CRLF, IDLE ON, DELAY 30. When the settings are correct, key "CONV" to enter conversational mode (the program is ready to talk to the mainframe). Dial the mainframe 1200 baud number (673-5821), and sign on (signon instructions are given below). When the mainframe has responded with "READY", key "edit yourfile.data new nonum" -- where "yourfile" is the chosen mainframe file name. Follow commands with a carriage return. The mainframe is now ready to accept the input file. Press function key 10 to return to the ASCOM program. Key "send

b:yourfile.txt" -- where "b" is drive B and "yourfile.txt" is the text file on the disk. The file will be listed to the screen as it is sent to the mainframe. When the transmission is complete, enter a carriage return to end the mainframe data reception mode. When "READY" appears, key "end save" to save the data. Then key "logoff" to end the mainframe session.

3. USING THE IBM MAINFRAME FILES

The IBM mainframe can be accessed via the phone lines by terminals or microcomputers with modems. The 1200 baud number is 673-5821, and the 300 baud numbers are 673-6111 and 673-6100.

A 1200 baud terminal is located in room 526. A dot matrix printer connected to it will print everything listed to the screen. The printing is controlled by a switch box. A somewhat faster line printer in the same room produces high quality print without tying up the terminal. The case survey files and programs are edited and used on the mainframe computer with the help of two software systems: TSO (Time Sharing Option) and SAS (Statistical Analysis System). TSO monitors conversations with the user at the terminal, edits and stores raw input data files and files of SAS commands, and initiates the processing of SAS programs. The SAS programs convert raw input data files into temporary or permanent SAS data sets, manipulate, sort, and format data, and produce reports and statistical output. EASA has instructional material for TSO and SAS.

The case survey data are stored in several TSO and SAS files. The file containing all current corrected cases is the SAS data set ALLCASES, which is stored in the SAS data base SASDB.DEVEL. This file should be the source of any modifications to this data, to avoid repeating the earlier data cleaning stages. However, the programs and files used to arrive at the corrected data set can be modified for use in creating a corrected data set from the next batch of case survey data. The raw input data in microcomputer text format is stored in the TSO files NOBLANK.DATA, NEW2.DATA, and NEW3.DATA. The first of these contains the raw data from the first phase analysis, and the others contain the data added in the second phase. The SAS program stored in TSO file INP1.CNTL converted these raw data files into SAS data sets (CASESURV, INP2, INP3, stored in SASDB.DEVEL), with a name, a label (short description), and a data type and size for each data item. INP1.CNTL can be used for input of more cases. The only change required would be to the output file name. The program RECODE.CNTL makes corrections to the current set of cases. It fills in missing data, specifically for the function subcategory code, deletes duplicate cases, and corrects some erroneous data. PURPOSE1.CNTL fills in missing purpose codes. These programs would not be applicable in their present details to new cases, but the code used for deleting, replacing, and merging could be adapted to a new set of corrections.

The ALLCASES data set was used to produce sorted lists, single field frequencies, and cross-tabulations. The program PRNT1.CNTL is an example of the creation of a sorted list of selected data items. FREQ1.CNTL produced frequencies for background project data (part 1 of the survey). FREQ27.CNTL produced frequencies for parts 2 through 7. Programs CROSS1.CNTL through CROSS3.CNTL and CROSSA.CNTL through CROSSK.CNTL (14 program files) produced a total of 46 cross-tabulations. Some of the cross-tabulation printouts are very long, because many of them do not contain collapsed variable values.

The data file is available by diskette or downloading and is accessible by modem through the AID computer center.